

B I B L E
W I T N E S S A N D R E V I E W

FOR THE PRESENTATION AND DEFENCE OF
REVEALED TRUTH

Εἰς ἀπολογίαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου κείμεναι

PHIL. i. 16

LONDON
OFFICE OF PUBLICATION, 25 PATERNOSTER SQUARE
1877

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
THE FEASTS OF JEHOVAH.—LECTURES ON LEV. XXIII.	1
THE OLIVE TREE, FIG TREE, AND THE VINE	49
UNION IN INCARNATION THE ROOT-ERROR OF MODERN THEOLOGY	55
SCRIPTURAL UNITY AND UNION	76
HAVE WE A REVELATION FROM GOD ?	101
CHRISTOLOGICAL PANTHEISM	193
THE CHURCH AND ITS PRIVILEGES	240
THE BEARING OF 1 PETER II. 24	251
BIBLICAL ANNOTATIONS	262
EPISTOLARY COMMUNICATIONS	364

THE FEASTS OF JEHOVAH.

LECTURE I.

THE SABBATH, THE PASSOVER, AND UNLEAVENED BREAD.

LEV. XXIII. 1-8.

It is my hope to bring before you, in the Scripture we have entered on to-night, the whole outline of the dealings of God with His people on earth, not of course in detail, but, first, the original purpose as before God ; next, the foundation which He laid in order to accomplish this purpose ; then, again, the ways of God in the application which He made of the mighty work thus accomplished ; and, finally, the direct and full result.

It will be proved in the course of these remarks that God did really look forward far beyond His ancient people. These feasts had a simple and primary application, as no one doubts, to the Jewish people ; they, at any rate the chief of them, served the purpose of gathering Israel around Himself where He had placed His name. But it is impossible to limit Scripture to such an application. I hope to give you what the Holy Ghost contemplates in the types ; for God was looking on to other things, and far greater than men are apt to allow. All was future in this point of view ; and even now we may see what will be, as well as that which is, and what has been accomplished. He has anticipated that which would have an entirely different and superior character, indeed what we commonly call Christianity ; He removes the veil from the age to come when He will establish the kingdom in glory. Thus we shall be able to trace the dealings of God, first, not merely in letter but in grace, and then, when it will be no longer grace but glory, and

B

It is not only that there is a complete term of glory as we are now going through a complete term of grace. In one feature, we may see, the feast of Tabernacles stands distinct from all the others ; and what is that ? The eighth day. There has been no mention of this in the other feasts. The seven days we saw were glory for the earth ; but there is the "eighth day too." It is heavenly and eternal glory ! So it is not "days" now, but this one "day," "the eighth day," and therefore it has a beginning, but it will never have an end.

We have seen then in this chapter—first, the purpose of God generally sketched ; next, the mighty work of the Lord Jesus, with the holy call it involves on all blessed by it, and the witness to Christ's resurrection in those risen with Him. But the application of that work is first to the Gentiles now called in. By and by, too, Israel will be awakened and confess their sins, when the days of glory dawn on earth, and not only this, but with a glance at that which is heavenly and eternal in the eighth day.

May the Lord bless His own word, so that you may be simple and clear and wise in the truth unto salvation ! And may you have your faith strengthened as you see how God has given a complete cycle of His ways in one of the most ancient books of the Bible. When the theological professors of our day are misusing their position to give currency to the cavils of unbelief, which have lost much of their acceptance even in free-thinking Germany, it is time for men whose fathers valued revealed truth to wake up to these insidious efforts at undermining their faith under the pretentious claim of learning and science. The best of all answers to Satan is a deepening entrance by the Holy Spirit into the truth, and an enlarged sense of that divine wisdom and grace in the word, which is as much superior to Elohistie and Jehovistic theories, or such like vanities and speculations, as the Second man is above the first. "Sanctify them by Thy word : Thy word is truth."

THE OLIVE TREE, FIG TREE, AND THE VINE.

THERE are three fruit-bearing trees, much esteemed and cultivated by the inhabitants of Palestine, which are fruitful in instruction for us who possess and peruse the New Testament. They are the OLIVE TREE, the FIG TREE, and the VINE. It was these of which Jothan made mention in his parable to the men of Shechem, which furnish parabolic teaching about Gentiles, Israel, and Christians. *Privilege, profession, fruitfulness*, such are the topics in illustration of which these trees are severally introduced.

1. The OLIVE TREE furnishes special instruction for Gentiles, as such, in the way of dispensational teaching. We meet with it once in this manner in Rom. xi., where a word of warning is given to those who are not of the race of Israel. Promises belonged to Israel as the children of Abraham (Rom. ix. 4). To the covenants of promise Gentiles were strangers (Eph. ii. 12). Promises there were, as has been remarked, *about* Gentiles, but not *to* them. To Abraham were they made and to his seed (Gal. iii. 16). Israel, on the ground of their lineage "after the flesh," looked for the fulfilment and enjoyment of them. John the Baptist had warned them how mistaken they would find themselves, if they trusted in this matter to natural birth without being born of God. God could of the stones around them raise up children to Abraham. The warning was in vain, as far as the nation was concerned. For they rejected the One to whom the promises made to Abraham were confirmed—that One was Christ, the patriarch's seed. God, therefore, has cast them off nationally for a time, and is dealing now with Gentiles. It is of

50 *THE OLIVE TREE, FIG TREE, AND THE VINE.*

this dispensational change that Paul writes in Rom. xi., and, to illustrate it in a manner within the comprehension of his readers, makes use of the simile of *an olive tree*, with which those in Italy would be familiar. From this tree, a good olive tree, some of the branches have been broken off, that is all the nation of Israel, except the remnant according to the election of grace, who remain branches in the olive tree, where they had always been.

Into this same tree other branches have been grafted, taken from a wild olive tree, one which had never been brought under culture. Now these are the Gentiles, with whom God is at present dealing in sovereign goodness, brought thus outwardly into connection with Abraham, the root of promise—the root, to carry out the figure, of the olive tree. Before the cross God was dealing with Israel as the elect nation, but not directly with the Gentiles. Privileges belonged to the former in which the latter had no part. The Syrophenician woman had to acknowledge that. She felt it, and she owned it. After the cross a new feature in God's dealings with man was displayed. The privileges which had marked Israel as God's special people on earth they enjoyed no longer, for they continued in unbelief. The aged Simeon had declared that the child he held in his arms would be “a light for revelation of the Gentiles,” to bring them out of the obscurity in which they had hitherto been dispensationally, as those with whom God could prominently deal in goodness ; and Paul teaches us this took place, when Israel for a time, as a nation, was cast off.

Advantages, then, Gentiles now possess such as they never had before the cross. The root of promise has not changed. The olive tree has not been cut down, but some branches have been broken off, and branches from a wild olive tree have been grafted in on the principle of faith. As grafted in they partake of the “root and fatness of the olive tree.” Privileges are theirs, as brought into direct association with the root of promise, Abraham, the father of the faithful. What flows from the root,

THE OLIVE TREE, FIG TREE, AND THE VINE. 51

therefore, they share in ; “of the root and fatness of the olive tree” they partake, being as Gentiles grafted in by faith into the line of promise on earth.

Now this is not salvation, for they might be “cut off.” It is not church position, for church position is new both to Jews as well as to Gentiles who enjoy it. But here it is, Gentiles coming in to share the privileges on earth of those who, as faithful among the Jews, had never lost them. We say *on earth*, for the simile of the tree teaches us, that the position, thus illustrated, is one enjoyed on earth.

Would, then, the Gentiles continue in this privileged place ? That depended upon them. “If thou continue in goodness.” Have they ? One must surely admit they have not. Excision, therefore, must take place. And, if the natural branches abide not in unbelief, they shall be grafted into their own olive tree. The good olive tree is Israel, the root is Abraham ; and the advantages Gentiles, as such, now possess, they can lose by unfaithfulness, for they stand in that place only by faith. God is now visiting the Gentiles (Acts xv. 14), and the outward result of this is what we term Christendom. Privileges those possess who are part of Christendom, but these privileges entail responsibility. Could the Gentile glory then over the Jew, the branches broken off ? He could not. To the Jew his natural place was in the olive tree, it was only from his sin of unbelief that he was broken off. To the Gentile it was of Divine goodness that he was there at all, grafted in on the principle of faith, to be continued there only if he abode in God’s goodness. All those then who are really saved are in the olive tree, but far more than they are numbered amongst its branches. It takes in the faithful remnant of Israel. It includes all Christendom. The Gentiles, if once cut off, will never be restored. The Jews may be, and will, if they abide not in unbelief. How truly will that be felt and confessed by and by, when that which Zech. viii. 13 says, shall receive its accomplishment !

52 *THE OLIVE TREE, FIG TREE, AND THE VINE.*

2. The FIG TREE suggests teaching of a different order, and was used as an illustration to a different audience. The Lord made use of it when warning Israel, and instructing His disciples (Luke xiii. 6-9 ; Matth. xxi. 19-21 ; Mark xi. 12-14, 20-23). Its fruit makes it of such value. If the tree is fruitless, why let it occupy the ground ? Now there is one feature in the fig tree which made it so suited to depict the state of Israel. Its flowers are formed before the bursting out of its leaves. Hence the presence of leaves suggests the promise and appearance of fruit. One sees at once, then, how fit an emblem such a tree would be of Israel, who by profession were God's people, but who, nevertheless, when the Lord came, proved by rejecting Him their unfruitfulness for God. The olive tree, as an evergreen, fitly represents the continuance of the line of promise on earth, which never would end, even in appearance, during all the ages that should precede the establishment of the Kingdom of God in power upon earth. As the olive tree from its character suggests the thought of continuance, the fig tree from its habit is well adapted to illustrate profession, which should be accompanied by the proofs of fruitfulness. And if it lacks such proofs, cutting down surely the tree richly deserves. God's forbearance then with the nation of Israel till the cross, the parable of the fig tree in Luke xiii. sets forth. The sentence on the barren but leaf-clothed tree on Olivet was the indication of the carrying out of the judgment against Israel, of which the Lord had previously warned the people. A tree cut down ceases to be seen by men. Israel, as an ordered nation, would cease to exist. Profession without fruitfulness will never do for God.

3. Turning to the VINE, we get instruction of a different character. It speaks of, and to, Christians in truth.

God had a vine, which He had brought out of Egypt : that vine was Israel (Ps. lxxx. 8-11). A vine which is unfruitful is useless, as Ezekiel (xv. 2-4) reminded his countrymen. The Lord then, in John xv., teaches His disciples that He is the *true* vine :

THE OLIVE TREE, FIG TREE, AND THE VINE. 53

hence fruitfulness in them could only be produced as they abode in Him. For those who were of the Jewish race this teaching was important : national position, a lineage after the flesh, such would not avail. They must abide in Christ to bear fruit for God :—teaching, too, this for us, useful, needful at all times. “I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman. Every branch in me that beareth not fruit he taketh away : and every branch that beareth fruit, he purgeth it, that it may bring forth more fruit. Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you. Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine ; no more can ye, except ye abide in me. I am the vine, ye are the branches : he that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit : for without me ye can do nothing. If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered ; and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned. If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you. Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit ; so shall ye be my disciples” (John xv. 1-8).

When we come to the Lord’s teaching about the vine, we leave dispensational truth about Gentiles and Jews, and come to that which is vitally important. But, to understand it aright we must ever remember, that the simile of a tree suggests something which is upon earth, not something about heaven. Keeping this in mind, we shall understand the bearing of what He says. He speaks of that which is seen upon earth : a branch, therefore, might be in the vine, and yet be unfruitful. But no one could be in Christ before God without being really a child of God. If we bring in standing before God when we read of the vine, we shall get all wrong. If we remember that a tree is a simile of something existing upon earth, we shall be kept right. A branch, therefore, in the vine is a professing Christian. There might be that without the person being a true believer. At the moment

54 *THE OLIVE TREE, FIG TREE, AND THE VINE.*

the Lord was speaking there was a marked illustration of it in Judas Iscariot. He was one of the twelve, appeared to be a believer, was a branch in the vine ; but his occupation at that very moment indicated that he had not abode in Christ. Mere profession, then, would not do. The Lord, however, does not stop here. He is not merely impressing on them that there must be reality and life to be fruitful ; He is telling them how, and how only, they can be fruitful, viz. by abiding in Him. The curse on the fig tree showed that God would not be satisfied without fruit. The Lord's teaching about the vine makes plain how fruitfulness can be ensured. Professors there might be, there have been, there are still. Of such, if that is all they are upon earth, the Lord speaks in verse 6 ; but let the reader remark He does it in language which, while pointedly showing the dreadful future of such, carefully guards against the idea of any real Christian perishing. Speaking to those who were true, He says, "*Ye.*" Describing the barren professor, He says, "*If a man,*" etc. There is no discouragement to the weakest believer. There is the most solemn warning for the mere professor.

UNION IN INCARNATION, THE ROOT ERROR OF MODERN THEOLOGY.

THE subject on which I would engage the attention of your readers is one which affects the whole character and nature of Christianity, branching out into what is really infidelity on one side, and abominable heresies on the other ; but held in its root principles by persons who would utterly reject both. It is found in the most highly esteemed ministers of the Free Church of Scotland and widely spread in it, in the Baptist Colleges, and taught by eminent Baptist ministers in the United States ; elaborately developed in the revived energy of evangelicalism in Germany, whence it has passed in a gross Puseyite shape to the Dutch Reformed Church in the States. Its full doctrinal results were developed in Irvingism. The worst kind of infidelity is based on it, to which the German doctors approach wondrously near.

The question is this : Was Christ in incarnation united to humanity to renew it ? or is the life of believers a wholly new life, in every case, and in the case of the church, believers united by the Holy Ghost to Him glorified ? Those orthodox in the main take up only the renewal of the first man ; the full-blown doctrine is Christ's union with fallen man. It is a capital question ; because one makes fallen man, the first Adam, that which is taken up of God for blessing as such, to which the Word therefore united Himself, and that (however sinless they may hold Christ to have been personally) in its sinful state, before redemption ; the other looks upon man in the flesh as utterly

THE CHURCH AND ITS PRIVILEGES.¹

THINGS, truths, not words, are my objects. But I had supposed that Kuriake (Κυριακή) was the source of *Kirche* in German, *Kirk* and *Church*. ("Kyroike"² I never heard of. It *may* be all right.) Some philologists now say that this is all wrong, and that kirk or church comes from the Saxon. I can only say I really do not know, nor have at this moment the means of ascertaining: if, indeed, it be ascertainable with any certainty. But the truth is, I have a great dislike of the word "church," because no man knows what it means.

What *does* it mean? Mr. G.'s congregation might build him a new church. Then it means a building. Or Mr. S. may be a member of Mr. G.'s church. Then it means an assembly under the presidency of Mr. G. In England, "he is going into the church," means, he is going to become a clergyman: he is gone to church, means the public service or worship: gone to the church, means the building again.

The Roman Catholic Church, and the Greek Church, are large bodies of persons professing Christianity, associated under these designations. So of Presbyterians, and Covenanters,

¹ We have just received from some kind friend in America a copy of a periodical of this year, containing an article, "The Old Testament Saints part of the Church;" and inside it a letter, by the author of "Have we a Revelation from God," reviewing and refuting it; and, as we think it likely to be useful to our readers, we will give them the opportunity of perusing it, and of judging whether "the visible church is identical under both dispensations;" and whether "nothing more can be said of the church now" than could be said of Israel.

² The word used by the writer of the article.

Lutherans, Episcopalians. If you press the matter, the church is the teaching authoritative part of it. This is so even among Protestants. The Thirty-nine Articles of England tell us the church can decree rites and ceremonies, and has authority in matters of faith. So that we have to know what a person means by "the church" before we can reply to a question as to it.

But I will just mention a little bit of history which refers to this, and why it is so current a word. When James I., or, as we should say with Scottish Covenanters, James VI., had the Bible translated, the translation in popular use was the Geneva one made by the refugees in Queen Mary's time. This always used the word "congregation." Now James had had a long experience, or knowledge at least, of his mother's conflicts with John Knox, and was not very fond of Scottish principles embodied afterwards in the Covenant, and used to say, "No bishop no king." He gave strict orders to have the word "church" everywhere, and not "congregation." Hence the prevalence of a word in the *English Translation* of the New Testament which has really no fixed meaning.

Say "assembly," which is the meaning of ἐκκλησία (ecclesia), and all ambiguity disappears. Ecclesia was the assembly of those who in the small Grecian states were citizens, and so had right to vote; and then it was applied to analogous bodies or meetings. We all know what an *assembly* means. Only now we have to do with God's assembly. For example, "Take with thee one or two more," etc.; "if not, tell it to the church." To whom is it to be told? Well, the minister, or perhaps the presbytery! With the Roman Catholic, "if he will not hear the church" assumes awful proportions.

Now say, as it really is, *the assembly*, and how simple all is. If wronged, go yourself first alone; if in vain, take one or two others; if still in vain, matters being ascertained, then "tell it to *the assembly*." For the present mixed state of things this

R

may seem inconvenient : but the sense of the words is plain enough.

Now apply this to Acts vii., "This is he that was with *the assembly* in the wilderness." Can anything be simpler? Israel was a vast assembly in the wilderness, and assembled themselves at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation. For though a different word in Hebrew, the tabernacle got its name from its being the place of meeting. But then, all possible reference to the church, *in the Christian sense*, disappears. Who denies that the six hundred thousand men who came constantly to the entrance of the court were an assembly? There were three words used for it, *Kahal*, as is stated by the writer, from *Kahal* the verb to call together, *Moeed* and *Heeda* or *Gneedah*, the two last from *Yaad*, to appoint a place or time of meeting. Hence the tabernacle was called Ohel Moeed, the tent or tabernacle of the congregation.

Israel was a great assembly or congregation, as none can dispute, but which proves simply nothing as to its being what God's assembly is, according to the word, now. It is Ecclesia, an assembly, in Acts vii., and the word being simply an assembled multitude, says just no more than that. The identical word is used when it is said, Acts xix., "having so said, he (the town clerk) dismissed the assembly." Put "the church" there and what nice sense you will have!

I quite understand it will be said, "Yes, but they were God's assembly in the wilderness." Admitted; but the whole question remains; that is—Were God's assembly then, and God's assembly now, constituted on the same principles, on the same basis? There was no question then of conversion, or faith, or anything of the kind, or even profession. They were, as Scripture expresses it, of the fountain of Jacob, descendants of Israel according to the flesh, and under condition of being circumcised the eighth day (which by the by none of those born in the wilderness were at that time). That assembly was a nation.

God's assembly now *is not*. The fact of being an assembly, or the word, proves nothing; the whole question remains:—Are the Israelitish nation, and God's assembly called by grace, the same thing, or assembled on the same principles?

This writer makes some enormous statements: *First*, "The church of Pentecost was Israel." Why, the Jews had openly rejected the Lord, and Peter in his sermon says to those who had ears to hear, "Save yourselves *from this untoward generation*," and the Lord Himself had said, "Henceforth your house is left unto you desolate; for I say unto you, ye shall not see Me henceforth until ye say, Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord." They were a judicially rejected people, though not for ever: and they are so to this day. They were "men of Israel:" but the assertion, inconceivable as it is, only shows how far a false principle can carry any one. God did not say in Joel "He would give the great outpouring of His Spirit to Israel." He said He would pour out His Spirit on *all flesh*. In patience with Israel He dealt with them, and began at Jerusalem: but it was the Holy Ghost being given to Cornelius that opened fully Peter's eyes, and the eyes of the Jewish Christians.

But let us enter a little more into the heart of the matter. This writer says of Israel, "'To them were committed the oracles of God:' 'To them pertained the adoption, glory, covenant, giving of the law, service, and the promises' (Rom. ix. 4). Nothing more can be said of the church now." Now here is the nucleus, the heart of the question: not the introduction of Old Testament saints into church privileges (unscriptural as that is), but reducing God's assembly now to the measure of Jewish privileges. The former might, alone, be treated as a mistake; the latter deprives God's assembly of its true divine standing, and that is what makes it of moment. The law was given by Moses: grace and truth came (ἐγένετο) by Jesus Christ.

Let us see what Scripture says on the matter. In the taber-

nacle there was a veil, behind which God sat between the cherubim ; the Holy Ghost thus signifying that the way into the holiest was not yet made manifest, while as yet the first tabernacle had its standing. Now, by Christ's death the veil is rent from top to bottom ; and we have boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, which He hath consecrated for us through the veil, that is to say, His flesh. We can walk, and are to walk in the light, as God is in the light. Is this "nothing more" to this writer? I will not insist on God's righteousness being declared now (the righteousness of God being *revealed*, not prophesied of) because I desire to take what is most positive and on the very surface of Scripture. See Gal. iv. : "Now, I say, the heir, as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a slave, though he be lord of all ; but is under tutors and governors until the time appointed of the father ; even so we, when we were children, were in bondage under the rudiments of the world. But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons ; and because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father. Wherefore, thou art no more a slave, but a son." Is it "nothing more" to be brought to be sons of God by known and accomplished redemption, and know it ; to live in the relationship, instead even of an heir differing nothing from a slave?

Will the writer allow me to ask him, Were the Jews under the first covenant, or the second, in their relationship with God? Are we under that first covenant? But more, we have the difference clearly brought out in Heb. x. 9, "He taketh away the first that He may establish the second." It will be said that these were ceremonies ; but what ceremonies? The priesthood is changed ; is that merely a ceremony, a better hope by which we draw nigh to God. And see the difference : the sacrifices

could not make the comers thereto perfect as pertaining to the conscience. There was a remembrance of sins every year ; now, we are perfected for ever who are sanctified ; so that Christ, when He had by Himself purged our sins, *sat* down at the right hand of the Majesty in the heavens. He is seated there, because all is done, till His enemies are made His footstool : and our sins and iniquities are remembered no more. The worshippers once purged are so in such sort that they should have “no more conscience of sins,” instead of a remembrance of them every year. We have eternal redemption, a purged conscience, because the sins are purged once for all ; and boldness to enter into the Holiest : “Giving thanks to the Father, who hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light” (Col. i. 12) : Having the knowledge of salvation given to His people by the remission of their sins. Is all this “nothing more” than Israel had ?

Take what is said by the Lord, and this will lead us to the question of the Holy Ghost. Than John Baptist no greater prophet had ever arisen, nor of those born of woman any one greater ; “but the least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he.” Many kings, prophets, and righteous men, had desired to see the things which the disciples saw, and had not seen them ; but “blessed,” said the Lord, “are your eyes, for they see.” They were more blessed than their kings and prophets—they had Messiah with them. Yet so great was the privilege and advantage of having the Holy Ghost, that it was “expedient” that Christ should leave them ; for, if He did not, the Comforter would not come ; but, if He went away, He would send Him. What a thing to lose, Christ’s personal presence in grace ! Yet so great was to be the effect of the coming of the Holy Spirit, that it was better He should go. Yet they would persuade us that He had been there all the time of the Old Testament ! See 1 Peter i. They searched their own prophecies and found they did not minister to themselves but to us the things now reported

by the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven. Was the promise to pour out the Spirit, or His presence "nothing"? Clearly it was not anything if He was there all the time as when poured out.

And now mark the foundation of this immense truth. God never dwelt with Adam innocent, nor with Abraham or others ; but as soon as even an external redemption was accomplished, we read " They shall know (Exod. xxix.) that I, the Lord their God, have brought them out of the land of Egypt *that I might dwell among them :*" and the Shechinah of glory came down and sat between the cherubim, and led them in the wilderness. So it was, when an eternal and full redemption had been accomplished, and man (though much more than a man) sat down in virtue of it at the right hand of God, that the Holy Ghost came down to dwell in God's people individually and collectively.

We must not confound between the divine action of the Holy Ghost and His coming in person to make His abode with us. I think it will be found in Scripture that all direct action of God from the creation is by the Holy Ghost. Even Christ could say, " If I, by the Holy Ghost, cast out devils." At any rate, He moved on the face of the waters. By His Spirit God garnished the heavens. He inspired the prophets, and wrought all through the divine history ; but that was not His personal coming. So the Son created all things ; but He did not come until the incarnation : " I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world ; again, I leave the world and go to the Father" (John xvi. 28). So speaks Christ of the Holy Ghost : " If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you ; but if I go away, I will send Him unto you ; *and when He is come,*" etc. (John xvi. 7, 8). And this was so distinct a thing that it is called " the Holy Ghost," without saying, came, or given, or anything else. Thus, John vii. 39, " For *the Holy Ghost was not yet*" (*given*, is added, it is not in the Greek text), " for Jesus was not yet glorified." So, the disciples baptized by John, in

Acts xix. 2, said, "We have not so much as heard *whether the Holy Ghost is.*"

All Jews knew there was a Holy Ghost; but this was His promised presence: and this is easily understood as to John's disciples, because he had spoken of Christ's work as twofold: He was the Lamb of God; and He it is that baptizeth with the Holy Ghost. It was the second great part of His work baptizing with the Holy Ghost; and it could not be done till He was glorified. So He tells His disciples after His resurrection, "Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." He Himself was anointed and sealed with the Holy Ghost when He stood, the first man fully, perfectly, acceptable to God, who had ever existed since evil entered,—perfect in Himself. "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power" (Acts x. 38).

And what is the effect of the Holy Ghost's dwelling in us? The love of God shed abroad in the heart by the Holy Ghost given to us (Rom. v.) We know that we are in Christ and Christ is in us (John xiv.) We know that we are sons and cry Abba, Father, the Spirit bearing witness with our spirit (Rom. viii.) He takes the things of Christ, the glorified man on high, and shows them to us (John xvi.) Our bodies are temples of the Holy Ghost which we have of God (1 Cor. vi.): so that God dwells in us and we in Him, and we know it by the Holy Ghost given to us (John xiv.) What eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor hath entered into the heart of man, God *hath* revealed unto us by His Spirit (1 Cor. ii.) Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty (2 Cor. iii.): and Christ living thus in us, the body is dead because of sin, the Spirit life because of righteousness (Rom. viii.) *Man at the right hand of God in righteousness, and the Holy Ghost dwelling in the believer as the consequence of it, characterise Christianity.*

All this is lost by this system [which tells us "that the visible church is identical under both dispensations"]. What

made it expedient for Christ to leave His disciples, we are told, is all the same as what they had before He came ! The anointing of the Holy Ghost is "nothing" !

Besides, "he that is joined to the Lord is one Spirit," and this leads to the corporate difference. Till Christ ascended up on high, there was no Man at the right hand of God, no one to whom the believer could, as a present fact, be united ; and, consequently, as we have seen, no Holy Ghost come down to unite him to Him. But Christ ascended up on high, a Man, in righteousness, and the Holy Ghost consequently came down : not to the world but to believers. Let us hold fast this great truth which is the essence of Christianity, as the cross and God's love are the foundation of it. The Head being on high, we are quickened together with Him, according to the power with which God wrought in raising Him from the dead and setting Him there ; and raised us up, Jews and Gentiles together, and made us sit together in heavenly places *in* Christ : (not with Him yet, Eph. i. 19-23 ; ii. 1-7). Neither part of this was true before Christ was glorified. There was no such glorified Man ; no Holy Ghost come down from heaven. On this, Scripture is as clear as possibly can be. There was the Son of God who could quicken ; but no raised glorified Man, whose going to the Father was the testimony of God's righteousness ; nor the Holy Ghost come down, the divine witness of it. We are members of His body : He has given Him, as so exalted, to be head *over* all things *to* the church which is His body. Thus, "by one Spirit we are all baptized into one body," Jews or Greeks. Israel had lost his place as such. There was no difference now. By the cross the middle wall of partition was broken down, and of twain one new man to be made ; and both reconciled to God in one body by the cross (Eph. ii.) Now the duty and essence of Judaism was the keeping of the wall up ; Christianity as a system on earth is founded on its being broken down. Were the Gentiles in the church brought into the Jewish state as is alleged ? No, He

makes of twain *one new man* and reconciles both, and came and preached peace to those afar off and those nigh ; for neither of them had it. The apostles and prophets (the prophets are the prophets of the New Testament, see Eph. iii. 5) were the foundation of a new edifice, "a habitation of God through the Spirit." This had never been promised, never revealed at all, could not have been. To say there was no difference between Jew and Gentile would have destroyed Judaism at one stroke. It was not revealed at all (Eph. iii. 4-11 ; Col. i. 26 ; Rom. xvi. 25, 26. In 26th verse it is not "the scriptures of the prophets ;" but now is made manifest by *prophetic scriptures*, γραφῶν προφητικῶν).

But the grand point is the coming of the Holy Ghost consequent on the exaltation of Christ as man in righteousness to the right hand of God. So when Christ says, "I will build my church" (on the revelation made by the Father to Peter), what was the meaning of that if He had been building it all the time, from Abel onwards ? The church, then, the body of Christ, is formed by the baptism of the Holy Ghost, consequent on the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God (1 Cor. xii. 12, 13). The Holy Ghost as so come "was not yet," when Christ was not glorified ; and this "baptism," as is declared in Acts i., took place a few days after, that is, on the day of Pentecost (Acts ii.)

Romans xi. has nothing to do with the church, "the body of Christ." It is the olive tree of promise (and the church was never promised even) ; and it is accompanied with a revelation that, when the Jews are grafted in again, the Gentile branches would be broken off. There were promises and prophecies at any rate, which apply to Gentiles as, "Rejoice, ye Gentiles, with His people ;" but if Israel be God's people, the church cannot exist with it ; for there (that is, in the church) there is no difference of Jew and Gentile, and blindness in part is happened unto Israel till the fulness of the Gentiles be come in. They are enemies as touching the gospel ; and "the casting away of them is the reconciling of the world." The church is "the body of Christ"

formed by the Holy Ghost on earth, while Christ sits on the right hand of God.

I should have many things to note if I merely took up the article. "House of the Lord," or any application of it to the place where the people meet, is wholly without foundation in Scripture. "The church of the wilderness" is also unscriptural. "The kingdom of heaven" is not the church at all. It is really too bad to say, "the apostles do not say a word about a new organisation." "There is a disannulling of the commandment going before for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof." Did not Paul organise the church? Were the priests and Levites, priests and Levites of the Christian church?

There would be another difficulty which has not been noticed at all:—That before exodus there was no assembly of any kind at all. Individual saints, Enochs and Noahs and Abrahams there were, but there was no assembly; but I do not go beyond what is on the surface of the article.

What I press is this, that the Holy Ghost is come; and that, when He came, the baptism, by which the saints were made one body, took place; the assembly is the body of Christ and the dwelling place of the Holy Ghost on earth: and it never existed before that baptism, and could not; for the Head did not exist; nor was the Holy Ghost, in consequence, descended to unite men to Him so as to form His body.

He gave Himself not for that nation only, but to gather together in one the children of God which were scattered abroad.

THE BEARING OF FIRST PETER II. 24.

THE true force of 1 Peter ii. 24 has been called in question by those who seek not only to make Christ's life vicarious, but His sufferings during the time of His active service penal. The thought that all the sufferings of that Blessed One have infinite value, and that they were all for us, every Christian heart would close in with adoringly. There may be obscurity of mind connected with it ; but the heart is right. But when intellectual proofs are attempted to be given to sustain unsound doctrine on this point, so as to undermine the true character and value of atonement, and to cast a cloud on divine righteousness, it is desirable then to maintain the truth. I do not hesitate to say that those who speak of the appropriation of Christ's living righteousness to us for righteousness, and hold the sufferings of His active service to have been penal and vicarious, have in no case a full, clear, and scriptural gospel. I am sure many, who from the teaching they have had hold it, are as far as my own heart could desire from the wish to weaken the truth of atonement and the value of Christ's blood-shedding, without which there is no remission. They have not seen the deep evil lying at the root of a doctrine which speaks of vicarious sufferings, and bearing of sins to which no remission is attached. I am quite ready to believe that the most violent accusers of the doctrine which looked to the sufferings of Christ upon the cross as the alone atonement and propitiation for sin do not wish to enfeeble its value. But we may inquire into the justness of all views which we do not judge to be scriptural, and press too with confidence what we find in Scripture.

BIBLICAL ANNOTATIONS.

MELCHISEDEC.

HEBREWS vii. 8.—There is really no solid ground for denying that Melchisedec was a man, as simply as Abram, Lot, or any other personage that figures in the description of Gen. xiv.

The mystery consists not in the person, but in the way in which the Spirit of God records his appearance and action in the scene, so as to make of him a suitable type of the Lord Jesus. Thus not a word is said of his birth, or of his death; there is total silence as to his ancestors; and no hint is given of the lapse of his office, or of any successor. The Holy Ghost, by Paul, argues from this silence (which is so much the more striking as contrasted with the well-known pedigree and succession of Aaron), and thus illustrates Christ's priesthood, which had really those features that are here shown to be typically foreshadowed in Melchisedec. For instance, while verse 8 refers to Melchisedec, all that is meant of him is that the testimony Scripture renders is to his life, not to his death; whereas it frequently speaks of the death of Aaron and his sons. The same principle applies to his "abiding a priest continually."

The Bible does not speak of his institution, nor of his resignation. When first we hear of Melchisedec he is a priest, and as such we leave him; no son, no successor, appears. The name, "King of Righteousness," the place, "King of Salem;" his sacerdotal office, especially in connection with so peculiar a title of God, "priest of the Most High God" (which, in its full import, implies the possession, *de facto* as well as *de jure*, of

heaven and earth) ; the circumstances ("met Abram returning from the slaughter of the kings") ; the character of his actions ("blessed him," and not merely sacrifice and intercession),—are all obviously and eminently typical.

There is scarcely more difficulty as to Melchisedec than as to Jethro, priest and king of a later day ; though of course the latter could not furnish so apt an illustration, in the circumstances of the case, as the former. Both were real, historical, and not merely mystical, persons.

Two remarks may be made towards the better understanding of this chapter and epistle. The first is, that, if the order is that of Melchisedec, the exercise is that of Aaron, as is most plain in Heb. ix. x. The second is, that in verses 18, 19 of our chapter, we must take "for the law made nothing perfect" parenthetically, and suppose an ellipse of *γίνεται* (not of *ἐτελείωσεν*) with *ἐπείσαγωγή*. In other words, "did" ought to be left out of the authorised version.

MATTHEW AND LEVI.

May I be permitted to express the following objections to Dean Alford's reasons, and, above all, to his conclusion, that Matthew and Levi are distinct persons ? It is agreed (1), that "the three narratives relate to the same event ;" and (2), that "the almost general consent of all ages has supposed the two persons to be the same." But, so far from allowing that his third fact is almost inexplicable, I can only admire, with Eusebius, the humility and candour of Matthew, who gives himself the same name at the receipt of custom by which he was afterwards known as an apostle. The other two Evangelists call him Levi as a publican, and Matthew as an apostle, which is surely a very intelligible thing on the supposition that he bore both names. Thomas is called Didymus by John only ; and Thaddeus (or Lebbeus, as in Matthew and Mark) is called

Judas by Luke and John, not to speak of his own epistle, with scarcely a note of identification. As to the fourth point, or "early tradition," that which separates the two persons is as minute as it is suspicious. Clement of Alexandria quotes the heretic Heracleon to the effect that Matthew, Philip, Thomas, Levi, and many others, had not suffered martyrdom. Is this most vague statement of a Gnostic—even if it were clear and certain, which it is not, that he means by this Levi the Levi of Mark and Luke—to weigh against the plain and strong presumptions of 1 and 2? As to (5) Origen's testimony (*contra Cels.* i.), it seems in this passage to distinguish between Matthew and, not Levi, but $\Lambda\epsilon\beta\eta\varsigma$. It is notorious that, elsewhere, Origen identifies Matthew with Levi. So that I am wholly amazed at the Dean's No. (6): "It certainly would hence appear as if the preponderance of testimony were in favour of the distinctness of the two persons." His notions of evidence must be strange indeed, to set the assertion of Heracleon, even if precise instead of being loose, and the statement of Origen, if confirmatory instead of being adverse elsewhere, and, as I think, even here, above his own first two arguments; especially as he is compelled to own how inexplicable on this supposition it is that Matthew should, in his account, omit all mention of Levi. In fact, such a theory, if true, would turn the seeming modesty of Matthew into a scarcely honest concealment of him who really gave the great feast. I have no doubt therefore, that the common view which identifies Matthew with Levi, as two names of the same individual, is perfectly sound, and the only tenable one.

THE CLOSE OF MARK AUTHENTIC AND GENUINE.

Mark xvi. 9, *et seqq.*—Having long since protested against those who treat this passage and the beginning of John viii. with suspicion, I proceed to state my reasons, passing over the

disputed place in John, which has been already well defended in another place.

Even Dean Alford, who certainly does not err on the side of credulity, admits that the authority of the close of Mark is hardly to be doubted. Eusebius, and the Vat. and Sin. MSS., omit it; and several others note its absence in certain copies, but generally add, that it appears in the oldest and best. All else of the Greek MSS., all the Evangelistaria, all the Versions (except the Roman edition of the Arabic), and a large proportion of the earliest and most trustworthy Fathers, are allowed to be in its favour. Lachmann, in spite of his notorious tendency to follow the very slips of the most ancient copies, edits the entire section without hesitation.

In his notes the Dean urges that the passage is irreconcilable with the other Gospels, and is disconnected with what goes before; that no less than seventeen words and expressions occur in it (some of them repeatedly) which are never elsewhere used by Mark, whose adherence to his own phrases is remarkable, and that, consequently, the internal evidence is very weighty against his authorship; that is, he believes it to be an authentic addition by another hand.

Before examining these criticisms, I must object to a reasoning which affirms or allows that to be scripture which is irreconcilable with other scriptures. If its authority be clear, every believer will feel that, with or without difficulties, all must be really harmonious.

But, it is said, the diction and construction differ from the rest of the Gospel. Did the Dean or those who think with him adequately weigh the new and extraordinary circumstances which had to be recorded? In such a case strange words and phrases would be natural if Mark wrote (nor does he by any means want ἀπαξ λεγόμενα elsewhere); whereas, another hand, adding to Mark, would as probably have copied the language and manner of the Evangelist.

Πρώτη σαβ. (ver. 9) is alleged to be unusual. Doubtless ; yet, of the two, it is less Hebraistic than τῆς μιᾶς σ. (ver. 2), and each might help the other to a Gentile or a Roman ear. And, so far from being stumbled by the way Mary Magdalene is mentioned here, there seems to me much force in Jesus appearing first to her out of whom He had cast seven devils. Who so suitable first to see Him and hear from Himself the tidings of His resurrection, who through death annuls him who had the power of death, that is, the devil? As to the absolute use of the pronoun in 11, 12, is it not enough that the occasion here required what was needless elsewhere?—If πορεύ. is found only in 10, 12, and 15, it is because the simple word best expressed what the Holy Ghost designed to say, whereas elsewhere the evangelist employed its compounds in order to convey the more graphically what was there wanted. Thus, he uses εἰσπορ. eight times, while Matthew, in his much larger account, has it but once. Is this the least ground for questioning Matt. xv. 17? So, again, Mark has παραπορ. in four different chapters, Matthew once only (xxvii. 9), Luke and John not at all.—Leaving these trivial points, the phrase τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ is to me an argument for rather than against Mark's authorship. Compare with it chap. i. 36 ; iii. 14 ; and v. 40. As to ἐθεάθη ὑπ' αὐτῆς and its difference from τοῖς θ. αὐτόν, the answer is, that the word is most appropriate here and uncalled for in other places, and if the difference prove anything it would show two hands instead of one supplementing Mark's narrative! Thus, for instance, the same verb occurs but once in all the epistles of Paul : are we, therefore, to suspect Rom. xv.? Matthew has θεωρέω only twice ; are we for a score of such reasons as these to speculate that "another hand" added Matt. xxvii. and xxviii.?

As reiterated mention of unbelief, and the Lord's upbraiding the eleven with it, what more instructive, or in better keeping with the scope of the context and of the Gospel? It was wholesome for those who were about to preach to others to learn what

their own hearts were, and the Lord in His own ministry sets them right before announcing their great commission. Even if we only look at the word ἀπιστία, it occurs in Mark vi. 6 ; ix. 24. If the verb is found only in ch. xvi. 11, 16, what more marvelous than Luke's having it only in his last chapter (ver. 11, 41), and never once using the substantive either in the Gospel or in the Acts of the Apostles?—It is true that μετὰ τ. and ὑστερον are found in no other passage of Mark, but his customary precision may be one reason why the former is not more common ; and the latter occurs once only in Luke and John.—It is confessed that τὸ εὐαγ. π. τῇ κρίσει is in Mark's style. The fact is, neither of the later Gospels contains the noun εὐαγ. and Matthew always qualifies it as "the gospel of the kingdom," or "this gospel ;" whereas, whether or not Mark has the qualified phrases in i. 14 and xiv. 9 (for MSS. etc. differ), he repeatedly has "the Gospel" elsewhere, as chap. i. 15 ; viii. 35 ; x. 29 ; xiii. 10. This, then, affords no slight presumption that the passage is the genuine production of Mark, as well as authentic.

Παρακολ. in 17, and ἱπακολ. in 20, occur nowhere else in Mark, and that for the best of reasons ; the accuracy which the compounded forms impart was demanded here, and not before, where the simple form sufficed. And this is the less surprising, inasmuch as the former appears only in Luke's preface, the latter nowhere else as far as the four evangelists are concerned.

As to the singularity of καλῶς ἐξουσιν, what simpler, seeing that this promise (as well as that about the new tongues, serpents, etc.) is revealed here only, and was unquestionably verified in the subsequent history? It is the natural converse of a common Scriptural designation for the sick, οἱ κακῶς ἔχοντες, and if the occurrence of ἀγγέλος should be here objected to, the reader may find it twice already in Mark vi., while Matthew and Paul use it each only once.

Only one further objection remains worth noticing, the use of κύριος in 19, 20. In Mark xi. 3, I suppose it is equivalent to

Jehovah, and at any rate I would not press this as in point. But the absence of such a title before seems to me a beauty, not a blemish, in Mark, whose business was to exhibit the service of Jesus. But now that God had vindicated His rejected Servant by the resurrection, now that He had made Him both "Lord" and Christ, what more natural, or even necessary, than that the same Gospel which had hitherto traced Him as the Servant, Son of God, should make Him now known as "the Lord"? But this is not all. The Lord had uttered His charge to those who were, at His bidding, to replace Him as servants, and in a world-wide sphere; He was received up to heaven, and sat on the right hand of God. Now it was Mark's place, and only Mark's, to add that, while they went forth and preached everywhere, the Lord was working with them. Jesus, even as the Lord, is, if I may so say, servant still. Glorious truth! And whose hand so suited to record it as his who proved by sad experience how hard it is to be a faithful servant; but who proved also that the grace of the Lord is sufficient to restore and strengthen the feeblest? (Compare Acts xiii. 13; xv. 38; Col. iv. 10; 2 Tim. iv. 11.)

DOCTRINE OF A FUTURE STATE IN THE PENTATEUCH.

The Apostle Paul tells us that life and immortality (*i.e.* incorruptibility, *ἀφθαρσία*) were brought to light by the Gospel. These truths were but dimly made known before, though there had ever been sufficient for faith to lay hold of. Thus, the very first book of the Bible shows us the care and solemnity which the wandering patriarchs attached to their burial (Gen. xxiii., xxv., xxxv., xlvii., xlix., l.); and the Apostle, in writing to the Hebrew Christians, affirms that it was by faith (not fasting, customs, or superstition) Joseph gave commandment concerning his bones. He believed in a God that

raiseth the dead, in a God who will surely raise them by and by, and give them a glorious link with the promised land, as well as with the city which hath foundations—the better and heavenly country. Again, our Lord convicted the Sadducees of not knowing the Scriptures, or the power of God as to a future resurrection state, and a present living to God, of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; and this from God's words to that Moses who is said by Gibbon to have omitted the doctrine, but who, on the contrary, records this revelation in the same book of Exodus which contains the law of Sinai. (Comp. Luke xx.)

I fully admit that there was a considerable measure of obscurity on this, as on many other truths, till He came who was the brightness of the glory of God, and the express image of His substance. But this was in perfect harmony with the Levitical or Jewish system, in which the veil was not yet rent, and God was governing a nation on earth as the vessel of His presence and testimony among the Gentiles. The faith of His elect, of course, penetrated much further, as may be seen in Job xix.; Ps. xvi., etc. But I am now explaining one simple and satisfactory reason why we should not expect a fuller statement of a future existence in the Pentateuch. It is because the main question there is of a people called to know the manifest exercise of righteous government on the part of a God who dwelt, and that even visibly, in their midst. Individual saints saw much more all through; but God's government of Israel on the earth is the grand topic of the Old Testament, and the true solution of this seeming difficulty, which is really in perfect keeping with the times, place, people, and circumstances where it occurs.

THE WORD 'Αἰώνιος.

Before treating of the force and usage of this adjective, it is well to examine briefly into αἰών, from which it is formed. The

earliest application of the substantive in Greek writers (as Homer, Hesiod, Pindar, the tragic poets, and Herodotus) is in the sense of a man's life, or lifetime. In the later history of the language (not to speak of its medical application to "the spinal marrow") it denoted a long period of time (Aeschin. Axioch. 17), while the philosophers employed it in contradistinction to χρόνος to express the duration, αἰών of eternal and unchangeable objects, χρόνος of such as are transient and corporeal. Hence αἰών was used in the ancient philosophy as = the infinite and immutable eternity of God, and by an obvious metonymy = God himself, and subordinate spiritual beings who were supposed to proceed from Him, the term of duration being also extended to those invisible agents or entities themselves. Thus Philo Judaeus says, ἐν αἰῶνι δὲ οὔτε παρελήλυθεν οὐδὲν οὔτε μέλλει ἄλλὰ μόνον ὑφέστηκε. This is important, as showing that in Hellenistic Greek authors of the same age as those of the New Testament the word was used properly and specifically to set forth eternity: "In eternity nothing is past or future, but only subsists." Equally plain is its application to the invisible beings or *aeons* of Oriental philosophy, as may be seen from the following extract, cited by Mosheim, from Arrian :—οὐ γὰρ εἰμι Διὸν ἀλλ' ἄνθρωπος, μέρος τῶν πάντων ὡς ὥρα ἡμέρας, ἐνστῆναι με δεῖ ὡς τὴν ὥραν καὶ παρελθεῖν ὡς ὥραν. Excluding the imaginary personal force, nothing can be clearer than its use in the time and language of the New Testament inspired writers to represent what is immutable and eternal. Aristotle, I may add, derives it from αἰεῖν ὦν (*De Coelo*, i. 11).

Besides, when qualified by words which modify its sense, it is used in Scripture for the continuous course of a given system ruled by certain principles, as in Matt. xii. 32 ; xiii. 39, 40 ; xxiv. 3 ; xxviii. 20 ; or, again, in a moral rather than in a dispensational sense, as in Gal. i. 4 ; Ephes. ii. 2.

I conclude, then, that while αἰών may be so used as to express the continuous existence of a thing which from its nature does

not last for ever (as human life, an unbroken age or dispensation, or the general course of this world), its proper sense, taken by itself, is to express eternity. And the same thing is true of *αἰώνιος*. It is used in certain special connections, as in Rom. xvi. 25 ; 2 Tim. i. 9 ; and Tit. i. 2, where *χρόνος* modifies its force, and gives a relative rather than an absolute sense ; but its natural meaning, unless positively restricted, is eternal in contrast with temporary. It occurs seventy-one times in the received text of the New Testament, the examination of which need leave no doubt on the believer's mind. Donnegan gives Philemon 15 as exceptional ; but he is, in my opinion, mistaken.

A DISPUTED PASSAGE.

1 John v. 8.—It is plain that “the Spirit” (*τὸ πνεῦμα*) means the Holy Ghost. He only is truth (ver. 6). Allow me to take this opportunity of expressing my regret that Prof. Gaussen (*Plenary Inspiration*, pp. 192, 193) should venture to defend the text. rec. of the two preceding verses, and in doing so to misstate, of course through inadvertence, the evidence. He ought to have known that the alleged testimonies of some early Latin fathers are very questionable, and that the most ancient MSS. of the Latin Vulgate are against the insertion of the disputed clause, not to dwell on the fact that the three Greek MSS. containing it, against near 150 which omit it, are not older than the fifteenth or sixteenth century ; at least, if the Cod. Neapol. belong to the eleventh century, the reading here is a correction made 500 years later.

As to the two grammatical considerations which he borrows from Bishop Middleton, I would briefly reply :—

1. That the words *ῥεῖς οἱ μαρτυροῦντες*, and *οἱ ῥεῖς* (verses 7, 8) are no insuperable difficulty. They are masculine, it is true, while the words to which they relate are neuter ; but the difficulty is nearly if not altogether the same, if the passage remained entire, as in the common text. If in that case the

principle of attaction is used to justify this irregularity, the principle of rational concord applies to the correct text; and the more especially, as τὸ πνεῦμα, that well-known personal object whose power wrought in the saints, is the first of the three witnesses who are specified immediately after. They are, as it were, personified as witnesses, and the gender is accommodated to the sense rather than in strict grammatical form.

2. The next objection is founded on the article being coupled with ἔν, as if it necessarily supposed a previous mention, which only occurs in the retrenched clause. But this is so far from being necessary that, even if ἔν were rightly read in verse 7, the object and force of τὸ ἔν in verse 8 is wholly different. In other words, supposing the passage in question to be spurious, the anarthrous form would be an error, and the article is required (*i.e.* τὸ ἔν) in verse 8; for the idea intended is not the numerical unity, but the uniform testimony of the Spirit, the water, and the blood.

It may be added, that all three, I believe, of these MSS. which contain the passage, omit the article before πατήρ, λόγος, and πν. ἄγ., which I venture to say is not even correct Greek, but just such phraseology as might come from an unlearned forger translating from the Latin. It was Erasmus who supplied the article to each of these words, with no other warrant than his own erudition.

THE OUT-RESURRECTION IN PHILIP. III. 11.

I think that the just inference from a comparison of the various texts cited from the Peshito-Syriac is, that this venerable version is lax in representing the true force of different phrases in the Greek New Testament on the subject of the resurrection; not only confounding things which are distinct, but adding, in most or all cases, an idea not suggested by the original.

As to the Greek, there are the strongest reasons for doubting

that ἐξανάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν is an inspired expression—I scarcely think that it is a correct one. But it is certain that A B (C is here defective) D E read, in Phil. iii. 11, τὴν ἐξανάστασιν τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν (F and G giving τῶν ἐκ, which seems to be a slip for τὴν ἐκ), while only two uncial MSS. of the ninth century, viz. J K, read τῶν without ἐκ. Accordingly, critics, with wholly different systems of recension, like Scholz, Lachmann, and Tishchendorf, reject the received text in spite of Griesbach's adoption of it, though he marked the right reading as probable.

It is not surprising that J. H. has failed to seize the exact point of ἐξανάστασεως νεκρῶν. The phrase is purely characteristic; and hence is anarthrous. The preposition is not omitted before νεκρῶν for the sake of euphony, as Mr. Birks supposes in a recent volume; but ἐξανάστασεως in Acts xxvi. 23 and Rom. i. 4 indicates the mode or condition in which Jesus should show light to Jew and Gentile, and be defined as Son of God in power; while νεκρῶν was added, it seems to me, as a complement, to denote that it was a resurrection in a proper or strict sense (not figuratively, as in Luke ii. and elsewhere).

It is a mistake to suppose the presence or absence of the preposition immaterial. The truth is that, while the resurrection of Christ, or of the just (*i.e.* those who are Christ's), like that of all others, is or may be styled ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν, never is the resurrection of the unjust designated ἀνάστασις ἐκ νεκρῶν—a phrase restricted to those who rise before the wicked. In other words, “the resurrection *from* the dead” (which it ought to be in Philip. iii. 11, as it is in Luke xx. 35, where the expression in Greek is rather the weaker of the two) is, *à fortiori*, “of the dead”—but the converse does not hold; and this suffices to prove their distinctness. I believe that the reader who is familiar with the Scriptures will the most readily acquiesce in this statement.

[Rev. xx.—I am glad to perceive that a too common misapplication of 1 Thess. iv. 16 is disclaimed. The truth of two distinct

resurrections does not require such pressure of texts into its service. The question of the length of the interval was of minor importance comparatively, but it is answered in that book which admirably and appropriately treats of it—the Apocalypse. May I be allowed to add that 1 Cor. xv. 23 has just as little to say to the resurrection of the wicked as the passage in 1 Thess. iv. Nor has any person the slightest authority from Scripture to connect what he calls the “trumpet blast” with any save the righteous. None else are considered in either Scripture. “The end,” in 1 Cor. xv. does not mean the wicked who are supposed to rise then, but the close of all God’s dispensational dealings, even of “the kingdom,” viewed from that point, which has been given up ; and *that* clearly supposes all judgment of quick and dead to be over. In other words, “the end” is *after* the wicked dead have been raised and judged.

As to the alleged distinction between *ὡρα ὄρε* and *ἐν ᾗ*, I do not think it has been applied aright in setting it against the plain statement in Rev. xx. of the period that transpires between the resurrection of the blessed and that of the rest of the dead. It was as uncalled for in the Gospel as it was in harmony with the Revelation of John, to enter into chronological times and seasons. Yet the Lord carefully guards against our inferring a *common* or general resurrection. All are to hear His voice and to rise ; but we have as distinctly as possible a resurrection of life and a resurrection of judgment, as in Rev. xx. They were not to marvel if He quickened souls ; for, at another epoch, He would be in such manifestation of power that He would raise bodies ; but the Gospel decides nothing as to the particular points in the *ὡρα* when good and bad should rise, the Apocalypse does. It seems to me not unlikely that the true reason why not *ὄρε* but *ἐν ᾗ* is used in John v. 28, is to distinguish an epoch where the action is immediate (as in John iv. 52, 53 also) from one wherein it is continuous or sustained (as in John iv. 21, 23, and xvi. 25). This, however, in no way clashes with the fact of

there being two distinct and contrasted resurrections, nor forbids our believing that one act is at the beginning, the other at the end of this $\omega\alpha$, while both are immediate, not prolonged.

THE GENERAL DESIGN OF THE GOSPELS.

It admits of the clearest possible internal proof—of course of an accumulative kind—that the Spirit of God employed Matthew to present the Lord Jesus as “the Son of David, the Son of Abraham,” *i.e.* in descent from the two leading points of Jewish glory and promise. Mark is occupied with the “beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God,” and thus naturally details the ministry, in all its varied circumstances, of one who was the ready, patient, and withal powerful servant of all the need that surrounded Him—of one whose dignity as the Son of God “could not be hid” in his least work here below. Next, the genealogy of Luke traces Jesus up to Adam, that is, as connected with the whole race, Gentiles no less than Jews, as Son of man and not merely the Messiah. These observations help to explain the comparatively large use of the Jewish prophets by the first of the Evangelists, while Luke, with equal propriety, depicts “that holy thing,” born of the Virgin, who increased in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man; and Mark, just as admirably, omits all notice of Christ’s parentage, His birth, His childhood, etc., and commences at once with the ministry of His forerunner and of Himself. Last of all, John gives a portrait of the Lord, in a point of view higher than the others, as the Word made flesh, who in the beginning was with God and was God, the true light, full of grace and truth. For this reason, as well as because the Jews are here regarded as merged in the universal darkness and death, no genealogy is given: His person and Divine relationship, not His human one, is the subject. It is not that the same truths are not recognised everywhere; for Jesus is owned

as Son of God in Matthew, and as Son of David in John. Enough is afforded by every Evangelist to show an unbiassed soul, that He, whom they all described, was God manifested in the flesh. Nevertheless it remains true, that each has his own proper and peculiar line ; that what has been already stated is the grand characteristic testimony of those inspired writers ; and that in this lies the real key, not only to the differences of language in what are called parallel passages, but also, as I believe, to whatever is inserted or omitted in the several Gospels. The Holy Ghost may allude to other glories of the Lord, in a biography which is specially devoted to trace Him in one very prominent character ; and with perfect wisdom He has thereby cut off the objection that the writers differed in their comparative estimate of the Lord. Not one of the Gospels, for instance, fails to notice His inflexible obedience, whatever the office sustained, whatever the light in which He was regarded. He could not but shine in this moral perfectness ; yet even here the attentive reader may perceive that it is pre-eminently Luke, whose business it was to illustrate His real and untainted humanity, as the obedient "Second Man," the Lord from heaven, in contrast with the first man, rebellious Adam : in a word, as the woman's Seed, rather than, as in Matthew, the true Messiah and rejected Emmanuel.

It is familiarly known that Matthew and Luke furnish two distinct pedigrees from David, the latter Nathan's line, the former Solomon's, which was the elder, and of course, Jewishly, the more important branch. As was usual in legal genealogies, the line of the husband is given by Matthew, who for the same reason records the supernatural dreams of Joseph ; whereas in Luke Mary is everywhere the more prominent personage of the two, and accordingly, as showing the source of His human nature, the genealogy here given is that of His mother. Hence, it is said by Luke, *ὡν υἱός, ὡς ἐνομίζετο, τοῦ Ἰωσήφ, κ. τ. λ.*, that is, reputedly, or in the eye of the law, He was son of Joseph, but

in fact, Mary's, as had been carefully shown in the preceding chapters. Thus, it is plain that there is nothing contradictory in these various accounts; nay, that each is as and where it ought to be, and is found in that Gospel whose character demands it, and there only. The Messianic descent of Matthew would be out of place in Luke, as the last Adam genealogy of Luke would not suit the historian who speaks emphatically of the Messiah, His relation to the Jews, His rejection, and consequently the transition to a new dispensation, which was to go on in mystery and patience, before the Son of man returns to establish it in manifestation and power; of which last phase the prophets had treated. Luke, on the other hand, was inspired to develop the great principles of God's grace towards man, and the broader moral grounds which they assume; and this is so true that, in the body of his Gospel, events are grouped in their moral connections, not in their chronological sequence, save where this is required for the truth of the narrative.

BAPTIZED FOR THE DEAD.

1 Corinthians xv. 29.—Some find great difficulty in understanding this scripture. But I rather see no reason for doubting that an old and common interpretation is the best, as it certainly flows from the obvious construction, and a very ordinary meaning of the words employed. After the positive revelation in verses 20-28, the apostle resumes his argument with *εἰ ὅλως νεκροὶ οὐκ ἔγ.* which he had pressed in verse 16, with its consequences as to Christ, themselves, and the dead. Here the apostle repeats the phrase of that verse, in view, first, of those who take the place of those who were fallen asleep in Christ; and, secondly, of a lot in this life most miserable, if hope be there only. Compare 29 with 18 and 30 with 19. To enter the company of such, if the dead rise not, would be folly indeed. Every proper lexicon or grammar will show to those who may

not be aware already, that *ἐν* has regularly and not infrequently the sense "in the place or stead of," which here, in my opinion, accords best with the previous context, the general reasoning, and the actual phraseology of this particular verse. *Αὐτῶν* is of course to be read at the end rather than *τῶν νεκρῶν*, as having the largest support of the best authorities, MSS. versions and fathers. A question might arise, as it has arisen, whether the first note of interrogation ought to follow *βαπτ.* or *ἐλ.*; but the substantial sense remains the same.

PERFECT, NOT SINLESS.

Matthew v. 48; 1 John iii. 9.—The first of these texts has no bearing whatever on the question of perfection in the flesh. It is the revelation of the name of our Father which is in heaven, and the character practically which suits the kingdom of heaven. The mere Jew was responsible to render testimony to the righteousness of Jehovah; the believer now is responsible to show forth the grace of "our Father." Vengeance on the Canaanites was then a righteous thing; now "if, when ye do well and suffer for it, ye take it patiently, this is acceptable with God." The children are bound to sustain the family character, "that ye may be the children of your father which is in heaven, for He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust. . . . Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." Other Scriptures prove, if proof were needed, that sin still abides in the saint here below, however bound he is to disallow and mortify it. This text simply exhorts us to imitate our Father's grace, even to those who deserve His judgment.

The other Scripture (1 John iii. 9) regards the child of God in that point which distinguishes him from the world, in the possession of a life from God which is absolutely sinless. No intelligent Christian will therefore forget that the flesh is still in us, though we are no longer in the flesh, but in the Spirit.

MY BRETHREN.

Matthew xxv. 40.—I think that it is clear and certain that those whom “the King” designates as His brethren here, are a distinct class from the sheep. It is not denied that all God’s saints are, or may be, viewed as “sheep.” All that is now contended for is, that in this scene we have certain godly Gentiles blessed and inheriting the kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world, but at the same time distinguished from others styled the King’s brethren, who had previously put these sheep to the test, and been the occasion of showing *their* difference from the goats, or the unbelieving Gentiles, who had dishonoured the King in His messengers. I add that the scene is a *millennial* one; not the gathering of the saints risen or changed before the millennium; not the judgment of the dead after it, but a scene on earth of living nations dealt with according to their reception or rejection of the King’s brethren just before this judgment (Matt. xxiv. 14).

THE MOUNT OF OLIVES CLEFT.

Zechariah xiv. 5.—It is evident, I think, that Azal is the name of a place, joined, as its origin indicates, or near, to the Mount of Olives. As it never occurs elsewhere in the Bible as a proper name, save of a person, it is not surprising that commentators have differed as to its exact locality, some placing it at the eastern, others, as Henderson, at the western extremity, very close to one of the gates on the east side of Jerusalem.

The meaning I believe to be that Jehovah, standing in that day on the mount (which is most precisely described, as if to cut off the idea of mere “beautiful poetical imagery”) shall cleave it in twain from west to east, half receding towards the north, and half towards the south; and that, if He fights with the nations which shall be then gathered against Jerusalem to battle, the

Jews are to flee to the valley of His mountains (so called because thus wonderfully cloven), for the valley reaches to Azal, whether it be considered as the *terminus à quo* or *ad quem*. The earthquake referred to is the same signal one from which Amos dates his prophecy. The Vulgate, it may be observed, takes 'לְנֶחֱלִי as an appellative, and gives us "usque ad proximum;" the Septuagint agrees with the authorised and most other versions as to this, but apparently follows the erroneous reading נְחֵלִי (which is actually that of four of De Rossi's MSS. not to speak of other authorities), instead of נְחֵלִי, i.e. the Septuagint gives *φραχθήσεται ἡ φάραγξ*, κ. τ. λ. (the valley shall be stopped up, etc.) in verse 5, which is evidently contrary to the best readings, and to the plain force of the context. It is scarcely needful to say that this prophecy has never been fulfilled. Even supposing that the Roman army under Titus could be meant, as Dr. Henderson affirms, by "all the nations," it seems extraordinary indeed that so sensible a person could see the rest of verse 2 accomplished there. I should have supposed that the impression left on the mind by the accounts of Josephus or any one else was rather that the city was taken, and that if half the people went into captivity, the rest were cut off from the city.

But if there could be reasonable doubt as to that verse, can it be pretended that at that time (and it is all closely linked in the prophecy) Jehovah fought with those nations, and that His feet stood in that day on Olivet, and that the mount was split in the midst? It is a weak and impotent conclusion that the flight to Pella, long before the city was taken by the Romans, is what is here so sublimely but withal most graphically predicted. When we take the latter part of the chapter into the account, the hypothesis is beyond measure harsh and contrary to facts.

It is only needful to add that the sense seems to require us to close one paragraph with "the days of Uzziah, King of Judah," and to begin a new one with "And Jehovah my God shall come

[and] all the holy ones with thee." The prophet suddenly addresses the Lord, and then proceeds with that day from a point of view which differs altogether from the preceding section, because it introduces His relationship permanently established with the whole earth, consequent on His vengeance upon the nations.

GREATER THAN JOHN THE BAPTIST.

Matthew xi. 2, 3.—I apprehend that one reason which has hindered many from seeing the failure of John Baptist is, that we are all slow in learning and owning our own weakness. The heart that has proved its own faltering in devotedness and testimony for Christ, will readily understand how John, as well as his disciples, may have been cast down, when the herald of Messiah was himself bound and gone to prison in sorrow, instead of the ransomed of the Lord coming to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads. But if the Lord notices indirectly, in verse 6, the stumbling of His tried servant (or certainly the blessedness of him who is not stumbled), He turns round to the multitude and graciously indicates the more than prophet place of John. I do not believe that verse 11 contains the least reflection on the Baptist, any more than verse 13 does on all the prophets. On the contrary, the former verse asserts for him the most distinguished place possible in the old economy ; while it discloses at the same time the surpassing glory which attaches to the least in the kingdom of heaven (*i.e.* the new dispensation, which was then preached, but only set up when the Lord, rejected by the earth, took his seat in heaven).

I am aware that some shrink from what appears such strange and undue exaltation of the New Testament saints ; but our wisdom is to accept whatever God gives in sovereign love. It is His to order all for the glory of His Son, while Satan would cheat us of His blessings through a spurious humility, which is really unbelief ; especially as the privileges given are the

measure of responsibility. If we lose sight of what God intends, we shall proportionately fail in our walk and worship.

HE THAT LETTETH.

2 Thessalonians ii. 6-8.—It appears to me that the Spirit here treats of the restraining influence and person with a certain studied obscurity, and that, if wise, we should not too hastily form conclusions. It must be borne in mind that the epistle was an early one, written to young converts who had enjoyed the apostle's oral teaching on the subject of the kingdom of the Lord Jesus (cf. Acts xvii. 7, with 2 Thess. i.), as well as on the matter in question (ver. 5). Further, if we attach any value to the idea, so prevalent in the early church, that the Roman empire was "the letter," or "what withheld," it is natural that the intimation should be but dim, especially if previously taught by the apostle. If the hindrance consisted in the presence and power of the Holy Ghost, whether personally in the church or governmentally in the world, one can understand how nothing more is here given than the assurance of a restraint up to a certain point. Thus, while the powers that be (whatever the form) are ordained of God, there is a time coming, as we know from Rev. xi.-xiii., when this shall cease, and the beast shall rise out of the bottomless pit (*i.e.* be resuscitated by diabolic agency in an exceptional and frightful way), when the dragon (*i.e.* Satan) gives him his power and his throne and great authority. The withholder will have then disappeared, or at least cease to act as such. The apostasy will have come, and the man of sin be revealed in the fullest way: for I do not deny a partial application of the prophecy to the papacy, while looking for a far more complete development of the evil. The revelation of the lawless one, who is clearly, I think, "the king" of Daniel xi. 36-40, will be characterised by an unprecedented energy of Satan "with all power, and signs, and lying wonders," similar language

as St. Peter uses of Jesus, "a man approved of God" by miracles, and wonders, and signs which God did by him. It is quite a mistake to suppose that verse 6 will bear "and ye know what is now restraining;" for *νῦν* is here a particle of transition, and fairly enough given in the English version. No more is implied than their general knowledge that there was a some one or thing which restrained; but *ὁ κατέχων ἄρτι* in verse 7 does mean that he restrains *now*. Next, *ἐκ μέσον* is correctly rendered "out of the way." It is its regular known force in sacred and profane authors, whether connected or not with verbs implying separation, as any good lexicon may satisfy any one. Thus, in *ἐκ τοῦ μέσου καθέζεσθαι* (Herod. iii. 83) the verb has nothing to do with that sense, which the phrase does carry. See also Dem. 323, 327 (Reiske). Accordingly the authorised version rightly connects *ἕως ἐκ μ. γ.* with *ὁ κατέχων*, while the beginning of verse 8 answers to the beginning of the 7th. If the phrase *ἕως ἐκ μ. γ.* applied to "the wicked one," and meant "till he appears," the force of *καὶ τότε ἀποκ.* would be weakened and useless.

FULL ASSURANCE.

Allow me to suggest that the common thought as to this phrase in Scripture is incorrect. It is not true that "full assurance of understanding" is the first of the three mentioned by St. Paul, but the last and highest. "Full assurance of faith" is the first: it rests upon the blessed work and sacrifice of Christ as a finished and accepted thing (Heb. x.) The next is "full assurance of hope," which looks for and anticipates with joy the time of glory and the inheritance of the promises (Heb. vi.) "Full assurance of understanding" supposes intelligence of God's ways in their height and depth, as developed in the mystery of Christ's heavenly glory, or, as it is said, "to the acknowledgment of the mystery of God." How many there are who are perfectly clear as to their acceptance, and who enjoy

the hope of Christ's return and reign, and yet are most indistinct and uninstructed in "the mystery," as taught in Ephesians and Colossians. So utterly false is it that "the full assurance of understanding," spoken of in Col. ii. gives birth to the other two.

CITY OF REFUGE.

Joshua xx. 6.—The true application of the type is, I believe, not to departed spirits, but to the Jews, who are providentially kept of God, but kept withal out of their inheritance, until the close of the High-priesthood which Christ is *now* exercising in heaven. He will then come out and bless the people of Israel, to whom the glory of the Lord shall appear. They knew not what they did when they smote and killed the Prince of Life. In the city of refuge they remain till the close of Christ's (heavenly) priesthood, after which they are to return to the land of their possession. See Numb. xxxv. 25, 28.

THE SAVIOUR OF ALL MEN.

The apostle had been showing how little profit there is in bodily exercise, whereas godliness is valuable for all things, having the promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come. This he pronounces a faithful word, and worthy of all acceptation : the reason appears in our verse. For therefore we both labour and suffer reproach (painful as it may be for the present), because our settled hope is in the living God, who is the preserver of all men, specially of the faithful. The question here is of His preserving care, and not of salvation only ; and this the apostle shows to be most true of those who are most tried by reason of their faithfulness. 1 Tim. iv.

DEATH ABOLISHED.

2 Timothy i. 10.—In this scripture our Saviour is represented as having abolished death (here personified, as is sin in Rom. vii.) Of course this does not mean that men no longer die as a fact, but that He has annulled the title of death as regards His own ; as in Heb. ii. it is declared He took part of flesh and blood, “that, through death, he might destroy (*καταργήσῃ*, the same word as here) him that had the power of death, that is, the devil.” But He has done more : He has brought to light life and incorruption (the body being in question, and not the soul only) through the gospel. It is not said nor meant that either was absolutely hidden, for enough was suggested for the faith of God’s elect to show that resurrection and heaven were in His mind, and not earthly blessing only, as Matt. xxii. 23-33, and Heb. xi. abundantly prove. Nevertheless, under the law, these were obscure subjects, because the ordinary and normal application of the law was found in present visible rewards or punishments from a God who dwelt between the cherubim on earth. The gospel does not speak of life and incorruptibility as utterly unknown before : on the contrary, it supposes them to have been partially seen gleaming here and there through the darkness ; whereas now they stand out in bold relief, the grand theme of evangelic testimony, as viewed in the person of the Lord Jesus. “Which thing,” as St. John says, “is true in Him and in you, because the darkness is passing, and the true light now shineth.”

THE DAY OF THE LORD.

2 Peter iii. 10.—I think it will be found that, while all three Scriptures are equally inspired, and therefore certainly and unmingledly true, our text takes a middle place, as to measure of light given, between the prophecy of Isaiah (lxv. lxvi., to which

the reference is clear) and the Apocalypse. And this exactly accords with its season historically. The Apostle of the Circumcision adds to the light we might have gathered from the Jewish prophet; for he discloses new heavens and new earth, not merely in a moral and incipient way, which finds its centre if not its scope, in the millennial condition of Jerusalem and her people, but in a full, physical sense, consequent upon the day of the Lord wherein the heavens pass away and the earth is burned up. But it was not the business of Peter but of John to lay down the positive landmarks of time, though he does not give us certain elements with more precision than the Old Testament promise he refers to. Accordingly it is in the Apocalypse that we meet the unambiguous statement that the reign of Christ and the glorified saints for 1000 years, besides a brief space after that, takes place after the partial accomplishment of Isa. lxxv. and before the fulfilment of Rev. xxi. 1. It appears to me that 2 Peter iii. embraces both these thoughts within the compass of "the day of the Lord," which is used in the largest application of the term, so as to include the acorn of Isaiah and the full-grown oak of St. John, who alone was given to see, or at least to make known, the exact times and seasons and years connected with the entire scheme. If we bear in mind that the millennium is styled "the regeneration" in Matt. xix., it may help us to see that the difficulty is not insuperable. "If any man be in Christ he is a new creature," or there is a new creation. That work done in the soul, one can take up the language of faith and say, "Old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new:" while yet it is evident that, as to fact, the full change does not pass over the man until the coming of the Lord.

Just so is it with the earth:—the millennium is "the regeneration," and so, even then, Isaiah can speak those rapturous words which, nevertheless, will not have their actual physical completion till that dispensation is closed. Besides, if the latter

is to be insisted on, Mr. B. has no right to include the millennial Palestine, or what he calls "the earthly paradise," among "all these things" that shall be dissolved : for Peter is speaking solely of present things, or things of a like nature, whereas the hypothesis Mr. B. combats supposes a vast and essential difference, at least as to Palestine, commenced at the beginning and complete at the end of the day of the Lord ; not as regards that land only, but the earth and the heavens as a whole. Now it is of the last or perfect change that Rev. xxi. 1 speaks, as it is there that we get the fullest light which revelation affords on this subject. And I must remind him of Bengel's wholesome words, "*Antiqui et ea autem et involutiora dicta ex novissimis quibusque et distinctissimis interpretari, non illis ad hæc enervanda et eludenda abuti debemus.*" Isaiah lxv. and 2 Peter iii. give no countenance to, while Rev. xx. xxi. positively excludes the wild fancy which has been revived, after a long slumber, that the nations, Gog and Magog, are the wicked dead resuscitated. And this is only one of the many absurdities into which a departure from the plain drift of these chapters reduces the wanderer.

THE MILLENNIUM.

2 Peter iii. 12.—1. The Millennium does not precede, nor is it subsequent to, but rather included in, "the day of God," as used here by St. Peter. That day means, as I suppose, the entire course of divine intervention, from the appearing of Christ in glory till the new heavens and earth. The millennial reign is a part of that grand scheme. Nor is there any serious difficulty in accounting for the existence of Gog and Magog (Rev. xx.), and of sin and death, up to the close of that reign ; because, even supposing none left alive in their natural bodies on earth at its beginning, save the righteous, it does not follow that their children must be. So that one can readily see how, during so

long a period of unbroken peace and blessing, there might be hosts of unconverted Gentiles, on whom Satan, when loosed, immediately acts in deceit, mustering them for the last rebellion against God. I must be excused if I think the solution which Dr. Cumming endorses contrary to Scripture. I see no ingenuity, but painful confusion, in viewing these nations, which are in the four quarters of the earth, as similar to the dead in their graves. Not the devil, but God, raises them, after all rebellion is over.

2. I think some will find that the main root of their difficulty lies in confounding the coming with the day of the Lord. The early Church was taught to expect the coming of Christ as that which might be at any moment; while, on the other hand, events were revealed as antecedent to the day of the Lord (not the *παρουσία* merely, but the *ἐπιφάνεια τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ*), which must necessarily occupy some years at least.

CONSCIENCE.

Scripture shows, I think, that conscience has a twofold character, which is rarely distinguished: 1. Sense of responsibility to God; and 2. Knowledge of things as good or evil in themselves. It is evident that Adam had the first character of conscience in Eden as well as out of it; but the second he had not till the fall gave him a bad conscience. Previously he was innocent,—not holy, but ignorant of evil, as an unfallen creature in the midst of what was very good. Before the fall he did not know what lust was, nor anything else of what we call moral evil. For the eating of the apple was evil, not in itself, but by God's command to abstain.

EVERY FAMILY.

Ephesians iii. 15.—I humbly think that it is wrong to speak

of what we lose by giving up a wrong translation for a right one; and it is confessed that "every family" is here required. Sure I am that the true rendering suggests not merely views equally valuable, but much more so than the false one, which has really confused and prejudiced the minds of Christians against that which otherwise might have been apprehended and enjoyed. I do not doubt that the phrase embraces the sum of God's intelligent creation, at least what is blest, whether in the heavens or on earth, angelic or human.

NATIONAL RESURRECTION.

Daniel xii. 2.—Many Christians, whose judgment is to be respected, apply this passage to a literal resurrection. But they are involved in difficulties, from which ingenuity essays in vain, as I think, to extricate them. Instead of commenting on what appear to me mistakes, let me state my firm conviction that a national resuscitation of Daniel's people, *i.e.* Israel, is in question here, as in Isa. xxvi. and Ezek. xxxvii. This being understood, the entire context is plain. It is at the time of their deepest distress that Michael stands up, and not merely are all those elect Jews delivered who have been glanced at in the previous parts of this prophecy, but many who are dispersed, as it were buried, or at least slumbering, among the Gentiles, awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. (Compare Isa. lxvi. *sub finem*.) Then follows the peculiar blessedness of the "Maschilim," *i.e.* the understanding ones, that instruct the mass in righteousness, who, instead of going out like the moon, though it may appear again, shine as the stars for ever and ever. This figurative application of a resurrection to Israel's circumstances at the close of the age is of course perfectly consistent with a real bodily resurrection of saints before, and of the wicked after, the millennium, as in Rev. xx. 4-12.

I am aware of the assertion that the phrase *אֵלֶּה וְאֵלֶּה* is never used elsewhere in Hebrew as distributive of a general class previously mentioned. But I believe it to be unfounded. The reader has only to examine Joshua viii. 22, and he will see that the pronoun is used in a similar way, Israel being the general class, and the same expression as here taking it up distributively. Accordingly, our English Bible in both cases, and in my judgment rightly, translates "some . . . and some." Of course it is not denied that in certain circumstances "these" and "those" would well represent the meaning. My opinion is that the other is an equally legitimate rendering wherever required by the context, as I conceive it to be in both the texts cited. And such, I find, is the view of the Vulgate and Luther as to Dan. xii. 2.

Again, I have no sympathy with those who apply this verse to mere temporal deliverance. But it is not a necessary inference, on the other hand, that the words "everlasting life" imply a resurrection-state. People forget that the saved Israelites in question are supposed to possess eternal life, which certainly may be before any change as to the body. It may help some readers to notice a somewhat parallel case, both in good and evil, as respects the Gentiles in Matt. xv. 46. Plainly they are the nations at the beginning of the millennium discriminated as sheep and goats, and dealt with by the King without delay. "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal." So, when Israel reappears in that day, sad examples are to be there, whose "worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched, and they shall be an abhorring to all flesh;" while others are to be brought an offering to the Lord, who shall not labour in vain, nor bring forth for trouble; for they are the seed of the blessed of the Lord, and their offspring with them. These awake to everlasting life; the others are abandoned to shame and everlasting contempt, apart from the question of resurrection. It will be a time, not of

national deliverance merely, but of signal mercy and judgment from God ; and this for Israel after their long sleep among the Gentiles, as well as for such Jews as will have figured more in the previous crisis in the land. The Maschilim seem to be a special class still more distinguished (ver 3).

THE BIRTH OF CHRIST MISTIMED.

In "The Phoenix," "a collection of manuscripts and printed tracts, nowhere to be found but in the closets of the curious (1707)," there is a paper with the above title, "proving that Christ was not born in December." The book is not very scarce, so I need not transcribe the article. The following is the substance of it, which may prove interesting :—

"David divided the year's service of the priests into twenty-four courses, and the eighth course fell to Abijah (1 Chron. xxiv. 10).

"The Jewish ecclesiastical year, commencing with the month Abib or Nisan, nearly corresponding to our March, O.S., the eighth course would occur at the end of June or at the beginning of July in our computation.

"Zacharias, the father of John the Baptist, was of the course of Abia, and as he was ministering, 'in the order of his course' (that is, in June or July), when the angel appeared to him, and that immediately on his return home his wife Elizabeth conceived, it follows that the conception of John the Baptist was about Midsummer, where we place his birth.

"In the sixth month of Elizabeth's pregnancy (Luke i. 26-36), *i.e.* in December, where we place Christ's birth, the angel Gabriel announced to the Virgin Mary that she should be the mother of the Christ ; and, counting onward for nine months, we come to the month of September, and to the Feast of Tabernacles, which was a type of the incarnation of the Son of God, as the period of the Saviour's birth.

"In which feast-time of eight days, Christ pitched in the tabernacle of His flesh amongst us, as appears, John i. 14 : 'And the Word was made flesh (*καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν*), and pitched his tabernacle amongst us :' He became a Scænite. Thus (we) behold the sweet harmony between the type and the thing typified, for Christ came not to break the law, but to fulfil it."

The error appears to have arisen from supposing that Zacharias was the high priest, in which case his ministry would have occurred in September. [Is there any other thought of this subject?]

THE SUITABILITY OF THE EVANGELISTS.

As a preliminary to any detailed observations on the Gospels, allow me briefly to notice the wisdom of the Spirit in the choice of each workman for his work.

“Matthew, the publican,” was not one whom man would have selected as the apostle and biographer of the Messiah. At first sight he might seem the least eligible for presenting the Lord to the Jews, for, as a class, none were in such disrepute as those Jews who consented to gather the taxes which the Romans imposed on their nation. But, regarded more closely, nothing could have been in more admirable keeping with the line of things which the Holy Ghost traces in his Gospel, for Jesus there is not the Messiah only, but the rejected Messiah. His rejection, with its grave and fruitful results, is just as much the theme as His intrinsic claims, with all God’s external attestations. And who so fit a witness of the grace which would seek the least worthy, if those “that were bidden” would not come, as he who was called from the odious receipt of customs?

In the second Gospel the Spirit is evidently developing the perfectness of the Lord’s ministry in word and deed. Now “John, whose surname was Mark,” was just the right person for such a task, always bearing in mind that none was fit unless immediately inspired to write. But, among those who were so empowered of God, John Mark was precisely the one fitted by personal experience to appreciate, when the Spirit gave him to indite that Divine account of the gospel-service of Jesus; for he had bitterly known what it was to put his hand to the plough and look back, with its painful consequences on all sides (Acts xiii.-xv.) But he had also learned, to his joy and the blessing

of others, that the Lord can restore and strengthen, giving us, through His grace, to overcome wherein we have most broken down. This very Mark subsequently became a fellow-worker of St. Paul, and a comfort to him, as much as earlier he had been a sorrow (Col. iv.) "Take Mark," says he, in his last letter to Timothy, "and bring him with thee; for he is profitable to me for the ministry."

For the writing of the third Gospel, again, Luke was manifestly the most appropriate instrument. From Col. iv. it would seem that he was a Gentile, and by profession a physician, both which particulars, as well as its dedication to Theophilus, wonderfully harmonise with the way in which our Lord is there depicted; not so much the Messiah, nor the Servant, but "the Man, Christ Jesus," the Son of God born of the Virgin, in His largest human relations, in His obedience and prayerfulness, in His social sympathies, in miracles of healing and cleansing, in parables of special tenderness towards the lost. It is this prominence of our Lord's manhood, as brought out in Luke, which to me accounts for the emphatic statements of grace to Gentiles, as it falls in with the special form of his preface, which has been so frightfully abused by rationalists in general, English or foreign. He lets us know his motives, and seeks to draw Theophilus by the cords of a man; but if there be thus a human side of the picture, there is another as divine as in the other Gospels, where the thoughts and feelings of the heart are not so laid bare. The notion that such an opening, touchingly suited as it is to the way in which our Lord is throughout presented in this Gospel, should induce us to regard the writer as a mere faithful and honest compiler, without supernatural guidance in the arrangement of his subject-matter, etc., is worthy only of an infidel. And it is only to cheat oneself or others with vain words to affirm that the occurrence of demonstrable mistakes in the Gospels does not in any way affect the inspiration of the Evangelists. The profanity of these statements scarcely exceeds

their folly, nor should I have taken this opportunity to denounce them if they were not at this moment finding extensive acceptance, especially among young students, not, alas! without the sanction of those who ought to know better.

Lastly, that St. John was eminently the right instrument for his task is most apparent. Who could so fitly, if so it pleased the Holy Ghost, set before us "the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father," as he who leaned on Jesus' bosom, —the disciple whom Jesus loved?

CHOICE OF SCENE.

It is the difference of design, which, to me, solves the difficulty stated by one objector or another. Matthew and Mark, in the body of their Gospels, are occupied with the Lord's sojourn and ministry in Galilee; Luke with not that only, but His gradual journey to Jerusalem (ix. 51; xiii. 22; xvii. 11; xviii. 31; xix. 28); and John with His ways and words in or near Jerusalem itself yet more than elsewhere, though Galilee and Samaria were assuredly not left out. What Matthew describes is the accomplishment of Jewish prophecy and the witness of Jerusalem's unbelief; while Mark's dwelling on the same arose, I think, from the fact that Galilee was the actual scene of our Lord's service, to which theme his Gospel is emphatically devoted. Luke, on the other hand, brings out the lingering of our Lord's love and pity; His face is steadfastly set on the place where He should accomplish His decease; but His slow steps attest the reluctance and the sorrow with which He visits Jerusalem for the last time, and affords the crowning proof of man's total ruin, in His blood and cross. John, finally, regards every place and being in the light of His personal Divine glory. Jerusalem, therefore, is no longer, as in Matthew, styled "the holy city." He was the light, the true light; all outside, and everywhere else, was but darkness, and Jerusalem needed the Son of God as much as Galilee, and was no more to Him, in that point of

view, than any other spot. He could, so far as Himself was concerned, freely speak and work there or anywhere. What was "this mountain," nay, what Jerusalem, to the Son of the Father? If there was nothing to attract, there was nothing in one sense which could repel. He who was full of grace and truth accepted His entire humiliation, and found objects on which to expend His love wherever He might move—in the boastful city of holiness no less than in the barren wilderness. It is the design impressed by God upon the several Gospels which thus simply explains a fact which is seen by, but useless to, him who denies that design.

THE STRAIT GATE.

Luke xiii. 24.—Strive to enter in at the strait gate : for many, I say unto you, will seek to enter in, and shall not be able.

The true solution I believe to lie not in the difference of striving and seeking, on which some have rested unduly, and others so mistakenly as in effect to make men their own saviours, but rather in this, that, while many will seek to enter in, it is not at the strait gate but by some method of human device. The natural heart dislikes God and God's way, and it easily deceives itself into a vague reliance on mercy without righteousness, which is an infidel thought, or into a vain confidence in religious ordinances, which is a superstitious one : in either way, man is lost. People might like to enter the kingdom, but not by regeneration through faith in Christ.

THEY SHALL RECEIVE YOU.

Luke xvi. 9.—Dean Alford's note is most objectionable in point of doctrine, as betraying no little ignorance of the true grace of God, whilst it displays also lamentable lack of acquaintance with the style of St. Luke. If one examine Luke vi. 38,

44; xii. 20; xiv. 35, etc., he will perceive that Dean A.'s oversight of the *usus loquendi* has opened the door for the wild notion that poor and needy friends, who have been helped here, are to receive us into the, or their, everlasting tabernacles with joy. It is clear that the difficulty is no greater as to "they shall receive," in Luke xvi. 9, than in "they require" (*ἀπαιτοῦσιν*), in chap. xii. 20. The meaning is simply "ye shall be received," "thy soul is required:" if more be meant, it is God, not man, who receives and requires. The grand point is the sacrifice of the present, in view of what is future and eternal. The question is not the means or title to enter the everlasting habitations, but the character of those who shall be received there.

PRIVATE INTERPRETATION.

2 Peter i. 20.—Permit me briefly to show why I consider the common view to be erroneous. In the first place it gives no reason for taking *προφητεία* as equivalent to an inspired declaration, predictive or not. Indeed, I am not aware that the word in the New Testament ever has this loose meaning, and I am quite clear that the verb from which it is derived countenances nothing of the sort in 1 Cor. xiv. 3, but simply contrasts prophesying with speaking in a tongue. In other words, that verse in no way defines prophesying, but compares its character with the gift of tongues. But, even if it were ever so used beyond a doubt in the New Testament, I am of opinion that the context here decidedly restricts *προφητεία* to the revelation of future events.

It is agreed that *ἐπίλυσις* means interpretation, or the act of interpreting, though some, as Calvin and Grotius, have been rash enough to venture on the conjecture *ἐπηλύσεως*, and many more have given the force of "movement" to *ἐπίλυσις*, while it would really require *ἐπήλυσις* (= approach), or some such word.

The main question remains as to the force and reference of

ἴδιος. One critic reasons from its frequent opposition to *κοινός*. But this is too narrow a foundation, because each of these words possesses significations not thus opposed. The fact is that, beside the elliptical *κατ' ἰδίαν*, *ἴδιος* occurs near a hundred times in the New Testament, and always means "own" (his, her, its, etc., according to the case). I have little doubt, both from general usage and from the verses before and after the passage under debate, that *ἰδίας* here refers to the subject of the sentence, *προφητεία*, and that the meaning is, "No prophecy of Scripture is (or is made) of its own interpretation." Taken by itself, it is not its own interpreter, but must be viewed as part of a grand whole, whereof Christ's glory is the centre. I must be excused, therefore, if I believe the idea of some to be as thorough a perversion of the text as the Romish one. One contends for the general right of man, they for the exclusive prerogative of the church so-called—both, in my judgment, dangerous errors, however concealed or explained. The Holy Ghost leads us to connect facts with God's purposes in Christ, and thus to understand and expound prophecy, which taken by itself is never rightly known. Even Rosenmuller, Wahl, etc., seem to agree with the view here contended for.

THE VINE OF THE EARTH.

Rev. xiv. 10.—"The vine of the earth" is the symbol of earthly religion in its last apostate state. Christ, the Lord from heaven, is the true vine; this is the false vine, the scene of whose judgment appears to be Jerusalem (cf. verse 20). Where Christ suffered, where the church of God first saw the light, it would seem that Satan will at the close completely triumph. It is important to note that it is a distinct and subsequent scene to the fall of Babylon, given already in the same chapter. If Rome be, as I believe, the centre of one picture, Jerusalem is, I think, of the other, the metropolis respectively of Gentilism and Judaism in their antagonism to God at the end of the age.

THE SPIRIT AND THE BRIDE SAY, COME.

Revelation xxii. 17.—I do not wonder that there are difficulties felt in accepting the interpretation of those who apply this verse exclusively to the Lord or to sinners. The truth is that the former portion refers to the one, and the latter to the other. Nothing can be sweeter nor clearer when seen. Jesus had just announced Himself as not merely the root and the offspring of David, but the bright and morning star. Immediately the church, with the bridal affections, says, Come. It is the Bridegroom that thus awakens her desires that He should come. He is the first object of the heart, and lest it should be thought to be a mere human, unsanctioned longing, it is added, "The Spirit and the bride say, Come."

But there are many who have heard His voice and been washed in His blood who yet feebly know their privileges in Him; they little if at all appreciate what He is as the Bridegroom, what they are as His bride. Are these to be silent? Nay, "let him that heareth say, Come." They may know his love but imperfectly: still let them not fear to say, Come.

But does not such a hope, such a waiting of the heart, hinder one's yearning after poor souls? Enemies have said so, mistaken friends may have thought so; but God links the two most blessedly together. If the bride, if the individual saint, owe the first love of the heart to Him who is coming to meet us in the air, so much the more can we turn round to the needy world and invite him that is athirst to come (not to say, Come, which to him, indeed, were but judgment). Nay, even if I meet a soul who perhaps has not yet known real soul-thirst, yet is willing, I can bid him freely welcome: "whosoever *will*, let him take the water of life freely." It is a perfectly beautiful scene, which the Lord grant us better to know and enjoy by the Holy Ghost!

ZECHARIAH XII.

One asks : 1. What will determine, even approximately, the date of this prophecy ? It is evident that the date assigned in some Bibles (B. c. 587) is a mistake ; probably B. c. 517 was meant, which would better accord with the previous dates 520-518 B. c. The Edinburgh Bible of Blair and Bruce, like that of the London Tract Society, gives the date according to your correspondent. On the other hand, the Oxford Bible (4to, 1845) gives a century nearer Christ, *i. e.* 487, both of which seem to me highly improbable ; while Bagster's Bible, after dating several of the preceding chapters B. c. 518, suddenly fixes chap. xiv. at B. c. 587 ; and Collins's Bible (1855) is equally strange, putting B. c. 587 to the preceding chapters, and B. c. 517 to chap. xiv. ! For myself, I see no reason to doubt that Zech. ix.-xiv. form a part of the great prophecy which commences with chap. vii. ; and I conceive that they may have been given in or not long after the fourth year of Darius Hystaspes. (Compare Ezra v.) To put this prophecy as far back as the reign of Nebuchadnezzar is, in my opinion, of all hypotheses the least reasonable.

2. The "idol shepherd" is Antichrist, whom retributive judgment is to raise up in the land of Judea in the last times. "If another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive." He shall in the end suffer the sternest vengeance of God. This is no modern opinion.

Pastor stultus, et imperitus (says Jerome, *Comment. in Zech.* lib. iii. cap. xi.), haud dubium quia Antichristus sit, qui in consummatione mundi dicitur esse venturus et qualis venturus sit, indicatur Iste pastor ideo resurgat in Israel, quia verus pastor dixerat : *Jam non pascam vos.* Qui alio nomine et in Daniele propheta (cap. ix.) et in Evangelio (Marc. xiii.) et in epistola Pauli ad Thessalonienses (2 Thess. ii.), *abominatio desolationis*, sessurus in templo Domini, et se factururus ut Deum, qui et per Isaiam magnus sensus dicitur (Isai. xxxii.) Tam sceleratus est pastor, ut non idolorum cultor, sed ipse idolum nominetur, dum se appellat Deum, et vult ab omnibus adorari.

3. There is no reason that I see for identifying the stone in Zech. xii. 3 with that in Matt. xxi. 44. The former evidently means Jerusalem itself, the latter the Lord Himself in two positions, answering to the two advents. First in His humiliation, He is a stone as it were in the ground, and "whosoever shall fall on it shall be broken," verified in all unbelievers, but especially in the Jews; next, He is exalted to heaven, and coming again in power and great glory, He will execute destructive judgment—"on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder." (Cf. Dan. ii. vii.; Rev. xix.) "A burdensome stone" is another idea, and will be true of Jerusalem in the latter day, when the Assyrian heads a grand Gentile confederacy after the Antichrist is disposed of, which is the subject of Zech. xii. 2-6, xiv. 1-3: also Isaiah, Micah, Daniel, and other prophets, treat of this closing king of the North.

4. There is no intermingling of the church or Christian body with the subjects of this prophecy. There may have been some partial application in the past, as there will assuredly be a complete fulfilment in the future; but it is Judah and Jerusalem that are in question, whatever profit the church or Christian may and ought to draw from this as from all Scripture.

5. The double reference of John xix. 36, and Rev. i. 7, is simply to link both advents into the prophecy, which mainly bears on the second, but presupposes the first. "They shall look upon Me whom they have pierced." But Rev. i. 7 is so far from intimating a general conversion of mankind previous to the return of the Lord, that it plainly enough insinuates their then unbelief, for "all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him." He will be unwelcome to them.

6. The mourning of godly awakened consciences, when Jehovah-Jesus is seen, to the final deliverance of Jerusalem and the total overthrow of all their Gentile foes, is most strikingly described in verses 10-14, but it is in terms which exclude the

revival in Ezra's time, save as being a feeble earnest. Each felt alone with the Lord ; and those families are specially named who represent prominent classes in Israel from the beginning, and throughout their history.

THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY.

The doctrine of the future state was taught in the Pentateuch, as well as in later parts of the Old Testament. It is absurd to pretend that Psa. xvi. 9, 10 ; xviii. 14, 15 ; xlix. 14, 15, were written after the Captivity ; or to deny that they reveal or imply the resurrection. There is no sort of difficulty in supposing that Zoroaster borrowed what he knew of this truth from Holy Writ, which was certainly more or less known to him. I am not at all disposed to give up Job xix. 26, 27 ; for I think it a decisive testimony to this precious truth, and the more striking as proving it to be held by saints outside the fathers, or the children of Israel : so that this again would readily account for traces of its traditional existence in the East long before the Captivity. In spite of all the assaults of critics, I am satisfied that, in all that is needed for bringing out a true bodily revival wherein the patriarch expected to see the Redeemer stand on the earth, the English Bible gives the substantial truth. So does the Septuagint, in spite of inaccuracies—*οἶδα γὰρ ὅτι ἀέναός ἐστιν ὁ ἐκλύειν με μέλλων ἐπὶ γῆς ἀναστῆσαι τὸ δέσμα μου τὸ ἀναντλοῦν ταῦτα*. So Jerome, in his interlinear exposition of the book, gives a version which is identical with his Vulgate save in the addition of one word, though I allow that his Latin is far more distant from the sense of the Hebrew than our authorised English. His comment is plain enough :—

Ego, inquam, jam corruptus ulceribus, in hac carne mortali incorruptus, per resurrectionem futuram glorificatus videbo Deum. Certus atque incommutabilis in hoc fundamento fidei ista loquebatur.

De Wette, it is true, gives a very different turn, adopting a

sense of the last clause of ver. 26, suggested in our margin ; but I unequivocally prefer the authorised text, for though *ἐκ* often occurs in the sense "out of," "without," "from," the meaning is not that he should see God apart from the flesh, or having no body, but that from out of the flesh he should see Him, or substantially "in his flesh." This is confirmed by the next verse, "Whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another :" a real resurrection of the body, and nothing else.

I believe that Isa. xxvi. 19, like Dan. xii. 2, refers to the national resuscitation of Israel, converted and restored by the power of God. The terms are of course borrowed from, and presuppose the known truth of, a bodily resurrection. See also Ezek. xxxvii. and Hosea vi. 3, xiii. 4, which, in my opinion, entirely relieve this interpretation from the charge of halting. The omission of the words inserted by our translators may help to make the meaning of Isaiah plainer.

THE INTERCESSION OF JESUS ON THE CROSS.

Luke xxiii. 34.—I am persuaded that it is perfectly true that Christ is here presented as interceding for the guilty people who took, and by wicked hands crucified and slew Him. The grand design in this part of Luke is to bring out the iniquity of Israel and the grace of Christ in spite of all. I say nothing of "Pontius Pilate," who, indeed, would have released Him but for fearing the Jews and Caesar ; but it is evident to me that the Holy Ghost by Peter expressly refers, in Acts iii. 17, to this intercession of Jesus, and proves that the people of the Jews and their rulers were intended. Further, the intercession did prevail partially as to sphere then, as it will by and by triumph, when "all Israel shall be saved." To lower the Lord's intercession to the mere pattern of various eminent persons forgiving their executioner, ought to be, in my opinion, repulsive to a spiritual mind. It needs little argument to refute the notion.

THE LAST DAY.

John vi.—It may help some of your readers to bear in mind that “the last day” has a broad moral force, like “the day of the Lord” in 2 Peter iii., save that it applies yet more extensively, taking in the resurrection of the saints, which “the day of the Lord” is nowhere said to embrace. Between John vi. 39, 40, and John xii. 48, the Millennium (Rev. xx. 4, 5) intervenes, “the last day” beginning a little before, and ending a little after it. It is a vague, or general expression of the entire closing scene, when man’s day is over and God acts in power, whether in blessing or judgment.

THE DEPENDENT ONE.

Psalm xvi. 2, 3.—I am of opinion that the main idea of the Psalm is the perfectness of Messiah’s dependence on Jehovah, shown in His humiliation here below (Heb. ii.), and vindicated in His resurrection (Acts ii.) Hence it is that, while a divine person, yet taking the place of a servant, His soul (for it is feminine) said to Jehovah, “Thou art my Lord ; my goodness is not to Thee.” It is the expression of his self-renunciation as man, which was in truth His moral glory. (Compare Mark x. 17-27 ; Luke xviii. 18, etc.)

On the other hand, He said, “To the saints who are in the earth, and the excellent, All my delight is in them.” This latter was acted out in His baptism, when He thus fulfilled all righteousness and identified Himself in grace with the godly in Israel. As man, He did not exalt himself, but gave the entire glory to God ; and this not in austere distance from the despised remnant who bowed to the testimony of John the Baptist, but graciously entering into and sympathising with their true place before God. “He that sanctifieth, and they who are sanctified, are all of one.”

THE FAITH.

Galatians iii. 22.—“Faith” is not here put for its object, I think, but is contrasted with the law when fully declared to be the sole means of justification, as it was after the cross of Jesus, when all pretension to stand before God on the law was manifestly at an end. Faith was always that whereby saints were justified really, even while the Levitical system had its place, and, if I may so say, obscured the faith which was within: then all that was outward fell, and the faith stood revealed.

THE SEPTUAGINT.

There can be no doubt of the fact that the Septuagint was generally used by our Lord and the inspired writers of the New Testament. But this fact ought not to be abused to the denial of what is equally certain—that it contains numerous mistranslations throughout, and is in no way to be compared for accuracy with the authorised version. Nevertheless the Holy Ghost condescended to use it freely, adopting its language, where true, even if it differed from the meaning of the Hebrew: just as occasionally He gives a paraphrase which differs from both. It was a most important witness already extant among the Gentiles, and God employed it in grace without in any way guaranteeing the inspiration of the LXX, or of their work. What would be thought of the argument that the works of Menander or Epimenides were inspired because the Holy Ghost cited them in the Epistles of St. Paul? It was not an unnatural thing that the early fathers, Greek and Latin, should attach an exaggerated value to the version chiefly in use among them. Not even Augustine knew the Hebrew original, and of the Latins scarce any save Jerome. It is much to be regretted that the idea should be revived by a respectable scholar of our own day.

WHO ARE "THESE KINGS?"

Daniel ii. 44.—The meaning is not the four kingdoms in reference to the fourfold succession in the metallic image, but rather, as it seems to me, an incidental allusion to the peculiar and complex constitution of the fourth, last empire of man. "The kingdom shall be divided," speaking of the feet and toes (ver. 41), and to this we must refer, as I consider, "the days of these kings" (ver. 44). The consequence is important; for thereby is excluded Mede's scheme of the *regnum lapidis*, first; and the *regnum montis*, by and by. I can understand this in a certain sense; but it is not the teaching, in my opinion, of this chapter. God's kingdom, here described and symbolised by the stone, is raised up not in the days of Augustus or Tiberius, much less in those of Constantine, but in the days of the decem-regal division of the Roman Empire. (Compare Dan. viii. 7-14, 23-26; Rev. xvii. 7-14.) The first exercise of its power is to break in pieces and consume all existing empire; all, at least included in the prefigurations of the statue. There is no such idea as the gradual action of the stone upon the statue; but a sudden and decisive judgment, which crumbles the statue into dust; after which, the stone which smote the image became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth. Evidently this is not the gospel which wins souls to Christ, and saves them; it is not a revolution, moral or material, which man brings about. It is nothing less than the power of God administered by the Lord Jesus; the stone cut without hands, dealing with the powers of the world, and judging their final antichristianism, in order to make way for His own manifest and immediate dominion. "And the Lord shall be King over all the earth: in that day shall there be one Lord, and His name one." I would add my opinion, that "these kings," symbolically set forth, by the toes here, and by the ten horns in Dan. vii., pertain exclusively to the West or European part of the Roman Empire. For we

must leave room for the destruction of what is represented by the gold, silver, and brass, no less than for the portion of iron and clay.

“THERE IS ONE BODY.”

Ephesians iv. 7.

If our readers will dispassionately inquire into the testimony of God's word, I am persuaded that they will distinguish, as Scripture does, between the saints of the old Testament and those who are now being baptized by the Holy Ghost into one body. The question of the one body really turns on that baptism. For those only who are baptized of the Spirit constitute that body (1 Cor. xii. 13) ; and it is certain that this baptism did not exist before the day of Pentecost. (Compare Acts i. and ii.) No one denies that the Old Testament saints were born of the Spirit, that they were justified by faith, or that we are to sit with them in the kingdom of heaven.

But the New Testament shows that a corporate unity, over and beyond their common privileges, was formed by the descent of the Holy Ghost consequent on the accomplishment of redemption by the Lord Jesus Christ ; and this solely is called the “one body.” Ephesians ii. iii. iv. are most explicit as to this.

None are contemplated as members of this one new man, save those in whom the Holy Ghost dwells, and so unites to a glorified Head in heaven. For the union here spoken of is an actual subsisting fact, and therefore incapable of being predicated, as it never is in Scripture, of saints previously. They had righteousness imputed to them, as it is to us ; but the Holy Ghost was not then sent down, as he is now, to baptize Jews and Gentiles that believe into one body.

Further, I am of opinion that Heb. xii. distinguishes in the most positive way between “the spirits of just men made perfect” (*i.e.* the Old Testament saints) and the “church of the first

born, which are written in heaven." So that this text, with 1 Cor. xii. and Ephes. ii.-iv., contradicts the ordinary confusion on the subject.

PARABLE OF THE VIRGINS.

Matthew xxv. 1-13. — Whether the lamps had gone, or were only going out, makes no real difference as to the grand teaching of the parable; and, as far as this goes, either the one or the other is quite compatible with the absence of oil. The statement that the foolish "have some oil" is most objectionable: not a word implies it; nay, what is said both by the wise virgins and the Lord would imply the reverse, even if we had not the plain and positive declaration that the foolish "took their lamps and took no oil with them." Why might not wicks be lit, and relit, without oil? I agree that "are going out" is a more correct rendering than the ordinary version; but it in no way shows that the virgins had oil, or that they were more than professors without the Holy Ghost, though responsible for and designated according to the position they assumed.

As to the unconverted being called "virgins," there is no more difficulty there than in the "servant" of the preceding parable. In either case they took that place, and were judged accordingly. There are Christians who love Christ's appearing in the midst of much ignorance as to its details. There are professors who talk much of the Second Advent, and hold it to be premillennial. But I assuredly believe that the former, if they are alive and remain till the coming of the Lord, will be caught up to meet Him, and that the latter, if they abide unregenerate, must have their portion outside, where shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.

As unfounded is the idea that *τάγματα* in 1 Cor. xv. 23,

means "company," "band," "regiment," while fully admitting of course that such is a frequent signification in profane authors. But here the context is decidedly adverse, whether τὸ τέλος be applied to the wicked dead, or to Christians uninstructed in the Lord's second coming and kingdom. All or most of the versions at all known and accurate (as the Syriac, Vulgate, Beza, Luther, De Wette, Diodati, Martin, Ostervald, the Lausanne, etc.) seem to agree with the authorised version in giving "order." Indeed, the way in which our Lord's resurrection is introduced appears to me of itself to exclude such a translation; for His resurrection is the first step, which perfectly agrees with "order," but not with "company." Again, such a view necessitates the harshest possible construction of "the end" (τὸ τέλος), which, by a figure, must be tortured to mean the good (or bad) who are raised then; whereas, in truth, it is most plain that "the end" is really after the kingdom is given up, and, *à fortiori*, subsequent to all judgment. The white-throne judgment of the dead is one of the closing acts of the kingdom, after which cometh "the end." Lastly, it would be incongruous to suppose that after "they that are Christ's" rise, another regiment of Christ's should remain to rise. Not a class, but an epoch, is meant by "the end;" an epoch subsequent to the resurrection of the wicked and their judgment.

"FOR EVER."

I am of opinion that εἰς τὸ διηνεκές, "for ever," ought to be construed in this verse, not with προσενέγκας θυσίαν, but with ἐκάθισεν κ.τ.λ. (i.e. with "sat down"). It is not exactly a question of the general sense, for there is good sense either way; and still less does it turn upon Greek construction, for the words might be taken before or after the verb or participle, as it seems to me. The real point is the special contrast of vers. 11, 12. Instead of offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, Christ has

offered once : instead of standing daily ministering for man, He has for ever sat down at the right of God. Of course this expression, "for ever," is not absolute, but relative to the work of atonement. He is seated in perpetuity before God, because His sacrificial work is done perfectly for man. As to the abuse, justly objected to, the aorist cuts off the force which Papists, and those who think with them, might give it, for where continuous offering is intended the present tense is employed, as in verse 1.

TEXTS MISAPPLIED OR MISQUOTED.

FALLEN FROM GRACE.

Galatians v. 4.—Often quoted to prove that Christians may, by falling into sin, jeopard the life which they have got in Christ. But the text speaks of those who had appeared to receive the Gospel letting slip the grand foundation of God's grace for ordinances, or, in other words, abandoning the ground of *faith for religiousness*.

THE HOPE OF RIGHTEOUSNESS.

Galatians v. 5.—We through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness by faith.

Not the hope of being justified ; for by Christ all that believe are justified from all things. We are not waiting for righteousness, for we are made the righteousness of God in Christ ; but we wait for the hope which is suited to such a righteousness, for a glorious resurrection or change, which is the only adequate complement of what we have already in Christ.

Ephesians i. 10.—The "dispensation of the fulness of times" is often applied to God's present work in gathering the church,

and connected with Gal. iv. 4. But the bearing of the two texts is totally different. Gal. iv. 4 refers to Christ sent here below ; Ephes. i. 10 to the administration which will be in His hands during the Millennium ; the one a past fact, the other future, and both entirely distinct from the gathering of Jews and Gentiles, who believe in one body, which is now going on between these two points.

i. 23.—“The fulness of Him which filleth all in all ;” not of God the Father, which the church is not nor can be, but the fulness or complement of Christ, viewed as the glorified heavenly man, whose body we are.

ii. 20.—Not Old Testament “prophets” and New Testament “apostles,” but “apostles and prophets” of the New Testament, as is put beyond all doubt in chap. iii. 5, “as it is now revealed unto His holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit.” It is a new work built on a new foundation, Jew and Gentile being now builded together for a habitation of God through the Spirit, which was not the case in Old Testament times.

iii. 15.—Not the whole family, as in the English Bible, but every family in heaven and earth, *πᾶσα πᾶντα, κ.τ.λ.*, including, I suppose, all the varieties of intelligent creation in heaven and earth.

iv. 3.—“The unity of the Spirit,” meaning of the Holy Ghost, and not merely of our spirit.

v. 14.—The Scriptures alluded to seem to be Isa. lii. and lx., but the application here is clearly to believers slumbering among dead men or things, from which they are called to arise, that Christ may give them light, not life, which would be their first need as unbelievers. Let me add, that in the parenthetical ver. 9 the true idea and word is “the fruit of light is in all goodness,” etc.

vi. 2, 3.—St. Paul is not of course neutralising the grand truth that we are not under law, but under grace. He is simply showing how specially God owned obedience of parent

among those commandments which were addressed to the Jews, and which held forth earthly blessing as their reward.

1 Corinthians ix. 27.—Often used to show that no believer ought to be or can be sure of ultimate salvation : hence, as is alleged, St. Paul was not. But it is clear that the question here is not of life, righteousness, or salvation, but of services in the Gospel and its rewards. Paul did not make himself servant unto all, under law to the Jew, without law to the Gentile, to save himself, but to save them. It was for the Gospel's sake, not for his own ; and to this end serve the figures of a prize and a crown. The word ἀδόκιμος, here translated a “castaway,” and elsewhere “reprobate,” “rejected,” is I think limited by the subject-matter. A servant might by carelessness lose a reward, who nevertheless as a believer had everlasting life. See 1 Cor. iii. 10-15.

1 Cor. xi. 28 ; 2 Cor. xiii. 5.—These texts are sometimes quoted to show that a Christian ought not to be sure, or, as men say, too sure of his acceptance with God. But it is evident that the first was intended to lead the Corinthians to probe their hearts, when disposed to deal lightly with the supper of the Lord. No such thought occurs as an exhortation to doubt God's grace, or their own security thereby. To eat the bread or drink the cup lightly without consideration of what that solemn feast sets forth was to deal unworthily : if one discerned not the body, it was to eat and drink judgment to oneself, as was shown in many cases of judicial sickness and death among them. For if Christians discerned themselves, *i.e.* the hidden springs of their hearts and ways, they should not be thus judged ; yet even where they were, it was the Lord's chastening, that they should not be condemned with the world. Even where thus negligent and chastened, neither does the Lord confound the Christian, nor ought the Christian to confound himself, with the world. If he does, the true power of self-judgment is gone. Still more explicit is 2 Cor. xiii. 5, however

familiarly used in the school of doubt. For let the context be read, and it will be plain that Paul is proving his apostolate to the Corinthians, who were seeking a proof of Christ speaking in him. Why, says he, examine yourselves : your own selves are the best proof. If you are in the faith, I must be an apostle—at least to you. (Cf. 1 Cor. ix. 2, 3.) The very last thing which these high-minded questioners meant to do was to distrust their own Christianity. Well, but, argues St. Paul, if you want a proof about me, know ye not your own selves, how that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates? Paul had no wish to prove them reprobates ; but his argument leaves them no escape. If they were in the faith, which neither they nor he doubted, they proved his apostleship : if they were not, who were they to examine him ? If verse 4 be taken parenthetically, the sense is clearer.

2 Cor. vi. 14.—Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers—often applied to marriage with unbelievers. But this is an error, though it is true that marriage ought to be “only in the Lord,” as is exhorted in 1 Cor. vii. The subject is the ministry or service of Christ. In service and worship, fellowship is forbidden with unbelievers, or unfaithful men. If I, a servant of Christ, am among such, I am to come out. What confirms it is—1st, That a yoke is a scriptural badge of service, not of marriage. 2d, That the believing wife is not to be separate from her unbelieving husband (1 Cor. vii. 10-16). On the other hand, the true inference from 2 Cor. vi. is that all communion between the Christian and the world, in the service and worship of God, is interdicted in every form and measure.

THE WORK OF THE SPIRIT.

The injunctions in Ephes. iv. 30, and Thess. v. 19, do not apply to all men, but are addressed to believers only. The

former warns those who are sealed by the Holy Ghost unto the day of redemption not to grieve Him ; the latter exhorts the brethren to “quench not the Spirit ;” to “despise not prophesyings.” It is clear that the one regards the saint individually as to his own walk with God ; the other guards him against hindering the action of the Holy Ghost in those whom He makes His mouthpiece. The striving of God’s Spirit in Gen. vi. evidently refers to the testimony given to the antediluvians, and especially Noah’s preaching for 120 years. Resisting the Holy Ghost is said of the Jews : “as your fathers did, so do ye.” It was shown in their persecution and slaughter of the prophets, and crowned by their treachery against and murder of the Just One. With all their boast about the law, the land, and the temple, they had rejected in every age God’s testimony : “Ye do always resist the Holy Ghost.” What man had done before the deluge, was the dreary history of Israel, till they stumbled upon their own Messiah, refused Stephen’s declaration of His heavenly glory as peremptorily as they had scorned his own personal humiliation, and thus turned that which ought to have been a foundation into a stone of stumbling and rock of offence. But it was not the Jew only who was guilty. “He was in the world, and the world knew Him not.” “Now is the judgment of this world : now shall the prince of this world be cast out.” The personal coming of the Holy Ghost testifies of this. His very presence in the church on earth convicts the world of sin, etc. For He came down, as sent by Him whom the world had rejected instead of believing in. Of other sins no doubt the world was guilty, but this was the great sin in God’s sight. He had sent His Son, and the world hated His Son. They had now no cloak for their sin. Christ, rejected by man, glorified by God, sends down the Comforter to be in His own, and thus convicts all outside of sin ; because if they believed in Him, they too would have the Holy Ghost. The passage does not speak of what the Spirit produces in the

heart of every one who comes to a saving knowledge of God and His Son. It is rather the truth that the presence of the Holy Ghost in the church proves all without to be under sin and judgment, because of the rejection of Jesus, whom God proclaims to be the Righteous One, by receiving Him to His own right hand. May I recommend "a well-digested and full reply on this subject," in a little book entitled "Operations of the Spirit of God"? More details still may be found in "Lectures on the New Testament Doctrine of the Holy Spirit."

THE TWO MINISTRIES.

Exodus xxxiv. 7.—The Gospel plan of salvation is not in the text, it is really the proclamation of the name of Jehovah in His government of Israel. Indeed it is rather a part of that which is contrasted in 2 Cor. iii. with the ministration of the Spirit now. There was a precious manifestation of God's goodness and long suffering, no doubt; but it was in connection with His people still under the law. Hence, in spite of all the mercy displayed, it could only be in result a ministration of condemnation and death. Whereas the essence of the Gospel is, that it comes to the sinner on the very ground that he is lost, and most expressly justifies the ungodly: it is a ministration of righteousness already accomplished on earth and accepted on high. So that, if the Holy Ghost reveal to any soul Christ in glory, that soul is entitled to look up and say, "There is my life and my righteousness." He is accepted in the Beloved. "If that which was done away was glorious, much more that which remaineth is glorious." The two things are so distinct that to harmonise is to spoil them both.

LIFE IN CHRIST RISEN.

Romans viii. 1.—It may help the reader to bear in mind the

observation of another, that the apostle, in the beginning of this chapter, is alluding to and summing up his previous reasoning. Thus, verse 1 answers to chap. v. ; verse 2 to chap. vi. ; and verse three to chap. vii ; as a moderate degree of attention and spirituality may easily discern.

“Justification of life” is what the first verse supposes, the possession of a new and risen life in Christ, to which sin is not and cannot be imputed. When God sent forth His Son he was made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem, etc. But now that redemption is accomplished and Christ raised from the dead, it is not merely the holy life which it always was, but it is life in resurrection after all the question of sin is settled. It is not merely justification in view of a foreseen work, nor a standing on the ground of promise—the promise of One who could not lie. The work is done, the promise accomplished—all the promises of God yea and amen in Christ : according to this is our standing as individual saints in Christ Jesus, and of this Rom. viii. treats. Corporate union is not discussed save in chap. xii. But many of our individual privileges, as well as our corporate ones, could not have been predicated of believers till Christ had finished His work on earth and sent down the Holy Ghost from heaven. I suppose (in spite of A D² and some good versions that have *μη κατὰ σ. π.* or of D³ E I K, etc., for *ἀλλὰ κ. πν.*) that the last clause was added to guard the full grace from verse 4, where the same words rightly occur.

THE LOVE OF CHRIST TO THE CHURCH.

Ephesians v. 26.—To understand this verse it must be taken in connection with what precedes and follows.

1. Christ loved the church, and gave Himself for it. His blessed work of redemption already accomplished.

2. That He might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word. His present work, which the Holy Ghost

makes good in the church. *Εν ρηματι* guards and explains *τω λουτρῳ*, showing that it is the power of the word, and not a mere rite. Compare John xv. "Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken to you."

3. The result, yet future, when He shall present to Himself the glorious church, not having spot, etc.

MOUNT ZION.

Hebrews xii. 23.—The phrase "general assembly" (*πανηγύξει*) is clearly, in my judgment, epexegetic of the preceding words, "the innumerable company of angels," just as, in the clause before, "the heavenly Jerusalem" is a further explanation of "the city of the living God." The conjunction *καί* introduces each new clause, which arrangement is destroyed in this particular instance, but observed in all the other parts of the sentence in the English Bible. The same confusion appears in Beza, Diodati, the Dutch, Martin, Ostervald, the Lausanne, etc. Bengel rightly objects to this construction. "Nam et polysyndeton retinendum est; et aliorum sine dubio est panegyris: aliorum, ecclesia, quis enim conjungeret synonyma, panegyris et ecclesia? Ecclesia, primogenitorum est; panegyris igitur, angelorum." But then he falls into the mistake of making, not only the angels, but the church of the first-born ones refer to the myriads, which is equally, as it seems to me, contrary to the linking of each separate term by the conjunction, not to speak of other objections. The Syriac and Vulgate, with those that follow them, Luther and the Elberfeld, avoid either error, and give the true sense with more or less clearness.

The apostle ascends from the lowest point of millennial glory which unites heaven and earth, the seat of royalty raised up in pure grace (after Ichabod was written on Israel, and the king of their choice was slain), in contrast with Sinai, which was the place and expression of the nation's responsibility. He then

gives, not the earthly city, which was under judgment, but the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem. Next is opened out the whole assembly (*πανηγυρίς*), myriads of angels. Then follows, as a specific object, the church of heavenly heirs, in contrast with God's earthly first-born Israel, which fully displays grace in its heavenly character. After this the Holy Ghost directs our eye to God in his judicial capacity—the Judge of all. With this is beautifully connected “the spirits of just men made perfect” (*i.e.* the Old Testament saints). Next, we turn to the means of establishing the New Covenant with the two houses of Israel, “Jesus, the Mediator of the New Covenant;” and lastly, we hear of “the blood of sprinkling,” which cries for grace towards the earth, not vengeance, as in Abel's case. To this whole order of things, which will only be manifested in the Millennium, the Hebrew Christians (and of course the same thing is true of all saints since) are said to have come, *i.e.* by faith. Not to Sinai and its associations of death and terror, but to these blessed and eternal objects of glory they stood related, through the known efficacy of what was accomplished to bring all in.

I suppose that the perfecting of just men here spoken of will take place at their resurrection from the dead. They are now in the condition of spirits—a condition which never will be true of the New Testament saints as a class (for “we shall not all sleep”), but, of course, most applicable to those before Christ. (Compare Luke xiii. 32.)

THE ETERNAL DAY.

2 Peter iii. 18.—I apprehend that *εἰς ἡμέραν αἰῶνος* is in allusion to and in contrast with “the day of judgment” (verse 7), “the day of the Lord” or “of God” (verses 10, 12), in the chapter which the phrase closes, and that the idea is the eternal day, which succeeds all previous days of sin and judgment. The

words in John vi. 51 (*εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*) are the commonest possible expression of eternity, or "for ever," whether absolute or relative, which of course depends on the context and nature of the case. See Matt. xxi. 19 ; Mark iii. 29, xi. 14 ; Luke i. 55 ; John iv. 14, vi. 58, viii. 35, 51, 52, x. 28, xi. 26, xii. 34, xiii. 8, xiv. 16 ; 1 Cor. viii. 13 ; 2 Cor. ix. 9 ; Heb. vi. 20, vii. 17, 21, 24, 28 ; 1 Peter i. 23, 25 ; 1 John ii. 17 ; 2 John 2 ; which are, I think, all the occurrences in the New Testament. *Εἰς αἰῶνα* (in 2 Peter ii. 17) has been dropped by some editors, though even they admit the same phrase in Jude 13. The omission of the article implies that the phrase is characteristic, *i.e.* adjectival of the sense ; and "everlasting," as "for ever," pertains to τοῦ σκότους, rather than to the verb. The plural form often occurs, as in Rom. i. 25, ix. 5, xi. 36, xvi. 27 ; 2 Cor. xi. 31, etc. ; or with πάντας, as in Jude 25 ; or yet more emphatically εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, as in Gal. i. 5, and often elsewhere. The idea here is not so much one unbroken eternity (expressed by the singular, simple or complex, as in Heb. i. 9), as the constant succession of age upon age, which is pretty well given in the English "for ever and ever." Ephes. iii. 21 is the most peculiar of all ; for γενεάς expresses ordinarily human generations, τοῦ αἰῶνος of itself would convey the thought of an undivided everlasting ; and τῶν αἰώνων closes the series with successive ages sweeping on. The whole phrase intimates, I suppose, a future beyond the bounds of every measure of time. The anarthrous form εἰς αἰῶνας αἰώνων occurs in Rev. xiv. 11 (where, however, C. has αἰῶνα αἰῶνος), which, as we have seen, modifies the sense so far as to present no positive object before the mind, as in Rev. xix. 3, and simply in this case characterises the action of the verb.

THE SEVENTY WEEKS OF DANIEL.

Daniel ix.—I do not think that there need be difficulty in supplying the Scripture authority, which has been sought in

vain, for the break between the last week and its predecessors. In fact, the prophecy itself distinctly furnishes the proof. For after the details relative to the periods of seven and of sixty-two weeks, in verses 25, 26, and the plain statement, that after these times were completed the Messiah should be cut off and have nothing (*i.e.* of His proper kingdom and rights, as far as the nations were concerned), the prophet goes on to describe the retributive days of vengeance which fell upon the city and the sanctuary through the Roman people (or "the people of the prince that shall come"). Now, it is clear, that here we have events which took place about forty years after the crucifixion, and yet entirely apart from the seventy weeks, save that they necessarily occurred after sixty-nine had run their course. But if they form no part of the previous chain, as shown by the prophecy, with equal certainty are they outside from and before the last or seventieth week, which presupposes the Jewish polity re-established in some sort, and the sanctuary not only rebuilt but in actual use once more, though doomed again to see greater abominations than before. I am confident, therefore, that the Scripture authority of Dan. ix. is, beyond reasonable doubt, against those who make the seventieth week to be in immediate sequence with the preceding sixty-nine, and that the passage itself, without going further, requires us to leave room for (not merely the past Roman destruction of Jerusalem, but) a prolonged series of wars and desolations of indefinite duration, which has been thus far too truly accomplished; subsequently to this, in verse 27, we have the brief but vivid picture of the last week ushered in by a compact or covenant made between the last Roman prince ("the prince that shall come") and the mass of the Jews; then, in the midst of the week, a stop put to their sacrificial worship, idols protected, and a desolator inflicted upon them, and this till the consummation and the decreed sentence be poured upon the desolate. Thenceforward should the tide turn, through the presence and power of their Deliverer,

once rejected but now returning in glory, not only to destroy this antagonist Roman sovereign with all his instruments and followers, Jewish or Gentile, but to apply to Israel, as such, all the predicted blessings of the new covenant. For such was the intimation of verse 24: "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy (Daniel's) people and upon thy holy city (the question being about the Jews, and not the church), to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins," etc. Accordingly, I think it demonstrable that all which God has been doing for and in His heavenly people since the cross is here entirely and advisedly passed by; and this is, no doubt, what is meant by "the parenthetical dispensation of the church." It may be added that this view of a detached seventieth week, reserved for the horrors of the future antichristian crisis, can in no way be objected to on the score of novelty, save by the ignorant: it is really the oldest interpretation that I know on record among the early Christian writers. Thus writes St. Hippolytus in the third century: "Τῶν γὰρ ἐξήκοντα δύο ἐβδομάδων πληρωθεισῶν καὶ Χριστοῦ παραγενομένου, καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἐν παντί τόπῳ κηρυχθέντος, ἐκκενωθέντων τῶν καιρῶν, μία ἐβδομάς περιλειφθήσεται ἡ ἐσχάτη ἐν ᾗ παρέσται Ἡλίας, καὶ Ἐνώχ, καὶ ἐν τῇ ἡμίσει αὐτῆς ἀναφανήσεται τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως, ἕως ὅ Ἀντίχριστος ἐρημώσιν τῷ κόσμῳ καταγγέλλων, κ. τ. λ." For when the sixty-two weeks have been fulfilled, and Christ has come, and the gospel has been everywhere preached, the times having been consummated, there shall be left one week—the last—in which Elias shall be present, and Enoch; and in the half of it shall appear the abomination of desolation, etc.

THE PERSONAL REIGN.

Without pretending to say what is meant by the expression "human kingdom," most readers will agree that, besides the sense in which Christ shall reign for ever, there is a definite kingdom over all people, nations, and languages, a kingdom heavenly in its source, earthly in its sphere (though not earthly

only), which is yet future, and to last for 1000 years. It is this which, I presume, the Querist meant by Christ's "human kingdom," to be ushered in by His personal advent. It has a mediatorial character, and will cease after the judgment of the wicked dead is over. When the eternal state begins (or the new heavens and earth in the fullest and final sense), the human holding of this kingdom is to cease (1 Cor. xv.), that God (Father, Son, and Holy Ghost) may be all in all. Christ, as man, having held this special kingdom for purposes of subjection, and having put down all other authority, gives it up, that the power may be God's, as such, exclusively. Our reigning in life, reigning for ever and ever, is not to be limited to the millennial kingdom. As possessors of eternal life and rejoicing in hope of the glory of God, we shall reign in everlasting blessedness, when the millennial display before this world is past.

THE LEPROUS HOUSE.

Leviticus xiv.—While unfeignedly believing that all Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable, I may suggest the need of a careful comparison of the fresh light of the New Testament in lifting the veil of the Old. Thus it seems to me that due consideration of Ephes. ii. and Heb. iii. would suggest the idea that "the house" finds its antitype in the corporate aspect or assembly of believers now, rather than in the millennial condition of the earth. "Ye are builded together," etc. ; "whose house are we," etc. Hence all is plain. A plague spot may now show itself in the Christian assembly. There is diligent, painstaking, but patient inquiry. The diseased stones are removed, the application of which is obvious. If the plague still overspread, after all means are used in vain, the house must be given up ; for the deliberate sanction and maintenance of evil deprives an assembly of its public Christian character. The

Y

mention of Canaan is no difficulty, because, in virtue of union with Christ by the Holy Ghost, we who believe are, even now, seated in heavenly places in Christ. Our *πολίτευμα* (citizenship) is in heaven.

“THE KING” IN DANIEL.

Daniel.—1. “The king,” in Dan. xi. 36, is, without doubt to my mind, the political side of the same person whom St. John designates religiously or irreligiously as “the Antichrist.” It is clear from Daniel that his seat of power is “the Holy Land,” the object of attacks at the close from the powers of the South and of the North (*i.e.* Egypt, and Syria or Turkey of our days). However, his destruction is reserved for the Lord Himself, appearing from heaven (2 Thess. ii. 8 ; Rev. xix. 20). It is of the Syrian power (whoever then may hold it) that the last verses of Dan. xi. speak. He also falls by Divine judgment (see Dan. viii. 25, xi. 45).

2. The relation of Daniel to the Revelation is a wide subject ; but this I may briefly say, that, as Daniel reveals the results of the failure of the earthly people Israel, so Revelation presents the consequences of the failure of the heavenly testimony throughout Christendom and the world at large. This remark may help to show the analogy and the difference between the two prophecies. What the former was to the Jew, the latter is to the church.

THE VINE AND THE TRUE VINE.

John xv. 4.—I do not think that living union with Christ is here spoken of, because verse 2 speaks of branches in Him not bearing fruit, which cannot be where Christ is the life. Compare also verse 6, which, if living union were in question, would contradict the everlasting life which the believer has. There is

some analogy thus far with Rom. xi., the olive-tree of testimony on earth, as the vine is of profession. Of course, in both cases, the saints are living branches; but there are other branches which are broken off. Oneness with Christ, as members of His body, depends on the baptism of the Spirit, which was unknown before Pentecost.

OUR CONFLICT.

Joshua v. 9.—With the Epistles to the Colossians and the Ephesians before us, I am of opinion that the wars of Israel have their answer in our wrestling with the powers of darkness; that the gradual acquisition of their land corresponds with our setting our affections on the things above, where Christ sitteth; and that we too have our circumcision, first in Christ, in whom the flesh has met its doom; and, secondly, in the practical way of mortifying our members which are upon the earth, etc. To neglect these cross-lights of the Old and New Testaments is to despise, unwittingly, the means of heavenly wisdom.

THE WORLD'S JUDGE.

Acts xvii. 30.—It is evident that the point of which St. Paul avails himself in order to reach the conscience of the Athenians is their own confessed ignorance of God (verse 23). "The times of this ignorance God winked at." But now St. Paul was declaring to them the God whom they knew not. The true God shines out in the death and resurrection of Christ. Not to receive what is proclaimed therein is to reject the counsel of God against oneself. Heathenism was essentially wrong; at the best it represented God as an hard master, as one (if one) who needed all that man could muster, instead of allowing Him the blessed place of the Giver, which even creation and providence proved Him to be, and much more redemption.

Accordingly, as the full light of God is shining the world over like the sun, and the sound of the Gospel is published in all the earth (in principle I mean), man is without excuse. For his case is not merely, like Israel's, failure under legal requirement, but the despisal of the full and free grace of God, who is now commanding all men everywhere to repent, to turn from their idols and their self-righteousness, from themselves in short to Him, and what He has demonstrated Himself to be in Christ towards the worst of sinners. To refuse is not merely to lose His everlasting mercy, it is also to brave His righteous judgment of this habitable world, for Christ is by Him ordained to judge it (and not only the dead raised before the great white throne), of which His resurrection is the proof. The world slew Him and God raised Him up, the sure proof that it is morally judged already, as it actually will be when Christ comes in the clouds of heaven. Up to Christ's first advent, and especially His resurrection, the Gentiles lay hid, as it were, as to public relations with God. Salvation was of the Jews. Christ's resurrection is a groundwork for faith unto all, Gentile as well as Jew, for death cuts all specialties in the flesh. Hence the special call to repent ever since ; always obligatory, repentance is now urgent. So as to the day for judging the habitable world: the preached resurrection of Christ, who is about to judge it, puts men under fresh responsibility.

GOD'S EARTHLY CENTRE.

Deuteronomy xxxii. 8.—The truth taught is plainly confirmed by the rest of the Old Testament, that Israel is God's earthly centre, around whom the nations are yet to revolve, when the Messiah takes His kingdom here below ; for the Jews (not the church; which has higher hopes) are the objects of God's counsels, as regards the earth and the nations.

THE AUTHOR OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

There are not wanting those who reject the commonly received opinion that St. Paul wrote this epistle. It may therefore be interesting to look at the historic proof of Paul being the writer.

There are several particulars relating to the personal history of the writer :—

1. He was not one of our Lord's disciples, and probably did not know Christianity till after our Lord's ascension (Heb. ii. 3). St. Paul we know was converted after the ascension of our Lord. (Acts ix.)

2. The epistle was written from Italy (xiii. 24). Paul was in Italy for some time.

3. The writer mentions some hindrance which prevented his leaving Italy (xiii. 19). This agrees with what we know of Paul, who was in prison there (2 Tim. i. 8).

4. The writer desired the prayers of his brethren for the removal of this hindrance (xiii. 19). This is conformable to the custom of Paul in his other epistles (Rom. xv. 30 ; Ephes. vi. 19).

5. The writer knew of Timothy's release from prison. Paul mentions this in 1 Tim. vi. 12.

6. Timothy was not with the writer in Italy, but was shortly expected (xiii. 23). This agrees with what we know of the situation of Paul when in prison (2 Tim. iv. 9).

7. The writer looked forward to travelling with Timothy to visit the Hebrew Christians. Timothy was Paul's constant companion in travel.

Here there are several particulars respecting the writer of the epistle, all of which agree with what we know of the history of St. Paul, but do not suit with what is known of any other eminent New Testament saint. It is highly improbable therefore that any other New Testament writer but Paul wrote this epistle.

Further : to none of the assigned writers do all the circum-

stances here noted suit, as far as we are acquainted with their histories. We know not that Apollos or Barnabas was ever in Rome, or suffered imprisonment there for the truth's sake. Luke and Clemens were in Rome, but we have no information of their having been imprisoned there; and further, neither were Jews (Col. iv. 11, 14), which it is probable the writer of this epistle was. In the absence of certainty, there is evidence enough, from the personal remarks of the writer, to lead us to the conclusion that Paul wrote this epistle. [2 Pet. iii. 15 seems to me decisive that Paul wrote to the Jewish saints; and this of course is no other than "Hebrews."—*Ed.*]

THE LAND SHADOWING WITH WINGS.

Isaiah xviii. 7.—1. "The land shadowing with wings, which (is) beyond the rivers of Cush," means, I think, a country outside the limits of those nations which up to the prophet's time had menaced Israel; a country beyond Assyria and Babylon, which were contiguous to one of these rivers and beyond Egypt, which lay along the other. For Scripture connects Cush with these two districts, if not with more: an Asiatic as well as an African Ethiopia. The meaning is, then, a land which should essay to protect the long-oppressed Jew, and that land beyond those rivers which characterised the great powers which hitherto were best known to and had most interfered with Israel.

2. It was not only a distant but a maritime power ("sending ambassadors by the sea"). "Vessels of bulrushes" looks more like Egypt than anything else in the chapter, but it cannot outweigh the other evidence. Perhaps others may throw light on the phrase. The burden of Egypt follows, and is expressly named in the succeeding chapter. Here the name is withheld.

3. It is distinguished in the plainest way from the nation in whose behalf it employs its vessels and swift messengers. I cannot therefore but think those commentators far astray who

interpret the land in verse 1, and the people to whom the message is sent in verse 2, of Egypt and the Egyptians. Happily here the question depends not on mere verbal criticisms, but on the general bearing of the context, which the English reader is quite capable of judging.

4. There is no doubt on either side that the same people to whom the messengers are sent are described in the latter part of verse 2, as well as in verse 7. The words which characterise them are certainly open, in their force and translation, to a good deal of dispute. Few, however, will be disposed to accept the notion that מְסֻשָּׁה = "harnessed in leather," which has not the least support from elsewhere. It is used in Prov. xiii. 12, of hope prolonged or deferred. Other forms of the same word occur frequently in the Bible, and mean to draw (literally or figuratively), stretch out, continue. Gesenius gives it here the sense of *duraturus, robustus*, which seems to me not to harmonise with the conjoined word. The English translators may have given the force of "scattered" from the fact that the *kal* participle (*poel*) means "him that soweth" (marg. *draweth forth*) seed in Amos ix. 13. I rather think the term alludes to the long trials and painful suspense of the Jews, and this seems confirmed by מְסֻרָה, "and peeled" or made bare, rather than "shaven;" for, in such an application, the word is used only of cases where the hair was fallen off (Lev. xiii. 40, 41), or forcibly plucked off (Ezra ix. 3; Nehem. xiii. 25; Isaiah l. 6). The sense of "peeling" the shoulder occurs in Ezek. xxix. 19, which would yield the same figurative sense, the latter being taken from the skin as the former from the hair. "Furbished" or polished is the general sense when spoken of the sword, metals, etc., and Gesenius thence derives the tropical meaning which he assigns to the word here, "*populus acer h. e. celer, vehemens;*" a highly improbable turn in my opinion. The general bearing of the next clause remains undisturbed. What follows is literally "a nation of a line, a line," which Dathe

connected, I presume, with Isaiah xxviii. 10, and our translators with chap. xxviii. 17 ; xxxiv. 11, 17 ; and Lam. ii. 8. Either of these, and the last particularly, I consider preferable to the far-fetched allusion to land-measuring, which, it will be observed, causes some to change "nation" into the "country 'meted out ;'" which is the more surprising and inconsistent, because in the sentence before it was justly remarked that it was the people, not the country. The same term *גוי* is used in both cases. I have no doubt whatever that *קִרְקוּ וּמְבִיטָה* describes not their vast strength, trampling down all before it (as Gesenius will have it), but rather their obnoxiousness to every form of hostile appropriation and indignity. (Compare Isaiah xxii. 5 ; xxviii. 4.) This is confirmed and determined by the last words of the verse, whether we adopt the textual rendering or the margin of the English Bible, or even Gesenius's theory of "cleaving," which he finds, though to my mind with slight show of evidence, in the word. Still any of these seem to me incomparably better than a fancied allusion to "inundation," which has really nothing to favour it, any more than the fancy that the previous words refer to the practice of sending pigs or goats to tread down the seed under their feet. I hope to be pardoned for considering them both an unlawful importation into this text. All these mistakes flow out of the first great error of treating the people under debate as the Egyptians. To this I may add that *מֵעֵבֶר* ("beyond") is made to mean "on this side," quite untenably, though at first sight there might seem more reason for it, especially in the English Bible. However, there is no space here to trace in what circumstances the word is susceptible of that force. I can only say that "beyond," as it is the natural, so here seems to me the true meaning. It is only in very special cases that we can give the other rendering, and the reason must be shown before it can be assumed.

5. As regards the intervening verses, 3-6, all are summoned to see and hear what befalls the people of the Lord, Israel. He,

as it were, retires, and watches. Man is active. The Jews, brought back by human intervention, seem to flourish ; but suddenly, "afore the harvest," all is arrested, and disappointment comes. The nations turn once more against the Jews. "They shall be left together unto the fowls of the mountains, and to the beasts of the earth." Compare the chapter before, especially verses 9-14.

6. "In that time shall the present be brought unto the Lord of Hosts of a people scattered and peeled, and from a people terrible from their beginning hitherto ; a nation meted out and trodden under foot, whose land the rivers have spoiled, to the place of the name of the Lord of Hosts, the Mount Zion."—Here, waiving the question of the terms repeated from verse 2, and already discussed, I think the English version is more accurate than most others. For there are in verse 7 not two peoples, but two things taught about Israel ; that a present should be made (1) of them, and (2) from them, to Jehovah of Hosts. The Jewish nation should be brought a present, and they should also bring one to the Lord in Mount Zion, after their signal deliverance from the fury of the Gentiles.

THIS GENERATION.

Matthew xvi. 28.—I am of opinion that the application of these words to the destruction of Jerusalem is entirely unfounded, and that their true connection is with the scene of the transfiguration. They are consecutive in all three of the first evangelists ; and 2 Peter i. treats that scene, it appears to me, as a manifestation of Christ's power and coming,—a sample of His future glory. James and Peter did taste of death, the one long, and the other shortly before Jerusalem was destroyed.

Dean Alford is not correct in making ἡ γενεὰ αὐτῆς = "this race," because the race of Israel is not to pass away when all these things are fulfilled ; but, on the contrary, Israel is then

to reach its full blessing and glory as a people here below. The true force is, "this" (Christ-rejecting, unbelieving) "generation of Israel," not the mere existing generation, but such as bore the same moral fruits as those who then refused the Messiah. So they have continued, and will, till after the last delusions and judgment of Antichrist, when "there shall come out of Sion the deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob." "So all Israel shall be saved," when every threat of God has been accomplished, and grace has converted a new generation—"the generation to come." The moral bearing of the phrase, permit me to add, simply and satisfactorily accounts for God's righteous judgment, in consequence of the blood shed from Abel downwards. Dean A.'s remark is sound against the application of it to the mere existing generation; but it almost equally disproves his own sense. Those who stood in the place of witness for God, as did Israel, not only suffered the consequences of despising His last testimony to them in Christ, but had required of them all the righteous blood shed from the beginning downwards. The same principle applies to Babylon in the Revelation: "In her was found the blood of prophets, and of saints, and of all that were slain upon the earth." In consequence of the position assumed, God will hold her responsible even for evil done before her existence. It is the principle of God's corporate judgments. Individually, each bears his own judgment.

GUILT AND GRACE.

Romans v. 15-17.—No exposition of this passage which I have seen has appeared to me quite satisfactory. My opinion is, that every one of these verses contains a separate thought, which is fitted, by its position and progression, to magnify the grace of God. The apostle is illustrating the leading truth of the Christian system, justification by divine righteousness accomplished in Christ; and, in order to establish conclusively the gra-

tuitous nature of it, he draws his illustration from the way in which we became guilty, viz. by the guilt of Adam's first sin. As we are reckoned by God, and treated, as in fact guilty persons, before we do anything personally to involve us in guilt, so we are reckoned by God as righteous persons, and are treated as such, before we do anything to make us righteous. There is thus a striking analogy or resemblance between guilt and grace—the fall and the restoration. But the apostle begins to show, at verse 15, that this analogy does not hold in all respects: “But not as the offence so also is the free gift.” This he does by showing that the side of the parallel formed by materials drawn from the new and gracious dispensation is the broader, deeper, and more outstanding and noticeable. It illustrates grace superabounding and triumphing over guilt in three particulars: 1. In its provision (verse 15); 2. In its communication (verse 16); and 3. In its consummation (verse 17).

1. *The Source*.—Verse 15 points us to the fountain-head or source of sin and righteousness; of guilt and grace. There is evidently a comparison of stocks or stores in this verse; and grace gets a triumph over guilt when we look to Jesus, in whom, as in a storehouse, all fulness of it dwells. If we are condemned for the sin of Adam, a mere creature like ourselves, shall we not much more be justified by grace for the sake of the Divine One, Jesus, who is “full of grace and truth”? If natural connection with the creature has brought us so much evil, much more shall spiritual connection with the God-man, Jesus Christ, bring us good.

2. *The Communication*.—Verse 16 shows that the communication of grace far exceeds the communication of guilt. Adam shares what is his with his race, so Christ shares what belongs to Him with His seed; but the righteousness which believers enjoy in Him covers far more than the guilt they inherit from Adam, for by Christ we are justified not only from the guilt of this one sin, but also from the aggravated guilt which

we have contracted by our "many offences," *i.e.* all our sins. Besides, we were involved in Adam's guilt by generic necessity; we are put in possession of righteousness in Christ as "a free and gracious gift."

3. *The Consummation.*—Verse 17. Here we have the rich excess of grace over guilt in its consummation, or in what it will do for believers when communicated to them and possessed by them. The point contained in this verse is this: If all connected with Adam are made subject to death for his one offence, much more shall all connected with Christ (who receive abundance of grace and of the gift of justification) not only have their original condemnation to death removed; but also reign in life with Him, on account of His obedience even unto death, and his resurrection, as their representative and living head, to the enjoyment of an endless life. Their connection with Jesus not only frees them from death, but it gives them a right to life, not only here, but in the glorious kingdom to come: "Being reconciled, we shall be saved by His life." He is now possessed of an ever-during life in resurrection, and all believers are sharers with Him in this life, for "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life." Just as death began in Adam the moment he sinned, so life begins in believers the moment they believe in Christ: "God hath given unto us eternal life, and this life is in His Son." And as the time is fast approaching when Jesus, the Son of God, who once suffered for sins, shall return to reign, all His saints shall then reign in life with Him: "For as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive." "Thou hast redeemed us, and made us unto our God kings and priests, and we shall reign on the earth."

The analogy being thus explained, limited, and illustrated, the apostle resumes his argument, and sums up the whole matter in verses 18 and 19, which contain his main position, which, in nearly the words of these verses, may be thus stated:—"As by one offence of one all connected with that one are condemned;

so by the accomplished righteousness of one all connected with Him have 'justification of life.' For as by the disobedience of the one (the representative) the many (the represented) were constituted sinners, so by the obedience of the one (the representative) will the many (the represented) be constituted righteous."

I should be glad to see the above passage in Romans thoroughly examined by you and your correspondents. It is one of the most vital, seeing that it forms the keystone of the gateway of grace. [See a paper by another writer at p. 348. —*Ed.*]

LOVE AND LOVE.

John xxi. 15-17.—I do not think that the student will get much satisfaction by reading the remarks of the late Dean Alford on this affecting scene. There is more, perhaps, in what the Archbishop of Dublin, Dr. Trench, has observed in his New Testament Synonyms. But the true difference seems to me much more simple than either of these gentlemen apprehend. 'Αγαπάω is the broad, generic term for loving. It is susceptible of all applications, of superiors, inferiors, and equals. It is predicated of God towards man, and of man towards God. It describes God's feeling towards the world in giving His only begotten Son. It describes Christ's tender and full affection towards the church. On the other hand, φιλέω is a narrower word. It is distinctively the love of feeling, of endearment, and hence frequently it is used of the outward sign of fondness, and also in a vague way of that fondness which produces the habit of this or that action, though this is true of ἀγαπάω too. Both are said of God's love to His Son. Dean A., if I remember rightly, considers that the Lord drops the word of reverential love (ἀγαπάω) which he had twice used, comes down to the word of human affection, Peter's own word (φιλέω), and this third time questions, not merely his loyal love for his master, but the very human regard of his heart. On the contrary, it appears to me, that while the Lord thoroughly

judges Peter's confidence in his own love to Him, in its so exceeding that of others that he could stand where they fled, He not only hears Peter's repeated declaration of his true and near affection for Him, but Himself takes it up the third time, and that this, flashing on Peter's threefold denial, went to his inmost heart. The Greek concordance utterly dissolves the idea that reverential love is the dominant thought in ἀγαπάω. We are not called so to love our enemies, nor even our neighbours (Matt. v. 43, 44 ; vi. 24). Nor was it so that Christ loved the rich young man ; and certainly none can pretend that God reverentially loved the world (John iii. 16) ; and this is not a tithe, perhaps, of the absurdity that follows Dean A.'s distinction, if I understand him. As little can φιλέω be reduced to the mere human regard of the heart. It is not thus that the Father loves the Son (John v. 20), or even us (John xvi. 27) ; nor can anything be more opposed, as it appears to me, to the true scope of 1 Cor. xvi. 22 ; Titus iii. 15 ; Rev. iii. 19, where φιλέω occurs. Let the reader judge.

SHIPWRECK OF FAITH.

1 Timothy i. 19, 20.—There does not appear to be any real difficulty in understanding how a believer might concerning faith make shipwreck, more than in practical holiness. Surely this was exactly what befel the late Mr. Irving, not to speak of Tractarian or Popish perverts. There is no doubt but that godly discipline may take its course, even to the extreme act of putting away in the case of real Christians, if they have got under the enemy's power in conduct or doctrine. The proper sphere of discipline is within (*i.e.* in the circle of those who bear Christ's name). Them that are without God judgeth. Those who keep the true Feast are bound to put out leaven ; and, if leaven in practice, still more in doctrine. For a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump. (Compare 1 Cor. v. and Gal. v.)

THE LIFE, NOT JUDGMENT, OF THE RIGHTEOUS.

There would be no point gained in supposing a universal judgment of all at the close ; but, on the contrary, great loss in force of truth. In fact, the idea and expression "general resurrection" is itself fallacious : for resurrection is of all things the most separative. Even John v. makes out two resurrections, irreconcilably differing in character and issues, as Rev. xx. shows them to be in time. The resurrection of life is in contrast with the resurrection of judgment (*κρίσεως*), and evidently, if involved in a common judgment, there would be no room for such a contrast. Matt. xxv. 34, etc., is essentially a millennial scene, not before nor after that epoch. Nor does it appear that any righteous die during the millennium, Isa. lxv. speaking only of those judicially accursed. The Son of man's coming as a thief is nowhere connected with the rapture of the saints ; but I say no more now, as this latter would involve discussion.

THE FIRST JEWISH MISSION.

It is plain that the Lord, in this chapter, sends the twelve upon a mission specifically Jewish. "Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not : but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matt. x.) Afterwards, in apprising them of the persecutions and treachery they were to expect, he bids them flee from one city to another : "For verily I say unto you, ye shall not have gone over (or finished) the cities of Israel till the Son of man be come." That is, their mission should be broken off, before it was complete, by the coming of their Master. Doubtless, another commission, expressly to the Gentiles, appears at the close of this Gospel, and the development of God's counsels, the mystery of Christ and the church, came out still later, chiefly through the ministry

and writings of the Apostle Paul. Thus the original Jewish mission was interrupted, and what has been aptly styled "the Gentile parenthesis" came in: this over, the Lord will, I doubt not, raise, at a yet future day, servants destined to take up the word and work now left in abeyance, and, ere they will have finished their proclamation of the approaching kingdom throughout all the cities of Israel, the Son of man will come. That work (wherever else the gospel has been carried) was not finished in the Apostolic era, nor will it be, when once more resumed in the latter day, before the Lord's return to establish the kingdom over the earth in power and glory.

THE LEAST IN THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

I do not think Luke xvi. 16 and Mark i. 1-4 intimate that John Baptist was "under the gospel dispensation." The kingdom of God might be said to be present in the person and power of Christ (compare Matt. xii. 28, and Luke xvii. 21); but, as far as others were concerned, all that the Lord says on this head, and after John was put in prison, is, "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand." It was not come for others to enter in till the work of redemption was accomplished, and then it was opened both to Jew and Gentile that believed. "Every man presseth into it," does not imply that any were yet within. It was being preached as nigh both by John and afterwards by the disciples; but, whatever the saving mercy of God might have been in past times, and of course then also, it was still an object of search and desire till the cross and resurrection of the Lord. Then it was come, and every believer entered, and the accession of spiritual blessing and privilege was such, that the least in the kingdom was greater than the greatest before, even than John himself, near as he was to it as just at hand. We must bear in mind that, as to John's testimony in John i. 29-34, iii. 29, *et seqq.*, it may have exceeded, more or less, his own intelli-

gence, as was often the case in the utterances of the Old Testament prophets. John Baptist did not know more than they, what it is to be purged worshippers, having no more conscience of sins. But this is only one of the many blessings that attach to all within the kingdom now.

I am aware that some, shrinking from the simple meaning because it traverses their preconceived thoughts, have sought to make *ὁ μικρότερος* the least prophet, others (*proh pudor!*) Christ himself; but such notions are unwarranted and untenable.

AS ORACLES OF GOD.

One is quite right in thinking that the apostle's word goes far beyond speaking according to the Scriptures, for a man might say nothing but what was scriptural, and not speak *ὡς λόγια Θεοῦ*. The passage implies that one should only speak when one has the certainty of uttering what one believes to be the mind of God. If there is not this confidence, one ought to be silent. It may be an artless message, possibly like that of Peter and John, displaying the speaker to be humanly ignorant and unlearned, and yet just the mind of God, suitable to the present need. This is to speak as oracles of God. Another might speak a word true in itself, but applicable to wholly different circumstances, warning where comfort was needed, instruction where the Spirit was rather calling out communion, or *vice versa*. To speak thus is not to speak as oracles of God. Of course, there is the other and equally imperative obligation on the part of those who hear, of examining all by the word of God.

DELIVERED FROM THE LAW.

Romans vii. 4.—It may be allowed that, in the previous verses which speak of the matrimonial obligation, ceremonial and social laws are alluded to; but in illustration of what?

Z

Clearly the Christian's relation to the law as a whole. Death severs the marriage tie : after that, there is liberty to belong to another. Just so, Christians are dead to the law by the body of Christ, who has in life accomplished it, and in death silenced all its claims for such as had failed under it. Our position now is, that we belong to another, even to Christ risen from the dead. The fifth verse is clear and positive that the moral law is meant, for it was that especially which provoked the passions or motions of sins in our natural state. "But now we are delivered from the law, being dead to that wherein we were held," etc.

I do not deny that the righteousness of the law is fulfilled in the Christian, that he walks in the love of God and of his neighbour, which is the fulfilling of the law ; but then it is because he is under grace, and not under law. He is not as a servant under this and that stipulation for so much wages ; he is set free in Christ's death and lives in Christ's life as risen from the dead—a condition of life which the law cannot touch, however it may fulfil the righteousness of the law, and far more : for we are called to be followers of God in a way which the law never demanded. The Lord grant all his own to understand better their own blessings in His grace, that so their communion may be deeper and more heavenly, and their walk in the same proportion.

THE COMING AND THE DAY.

2 Thessalonians ii. 2.—It is quite right to distinguish between "the coming" and "the day of the Lord." They are not the same thing, though of course closely connected. Again, it is certain that ἐνέστηκεν means "is actually come," or "is present," and not "is at hand." But it is a mistake to assume that the Thessalonian saints then knew the relative order of these two things ; and this ignorance on all sides gave occasion for the false teachers to trouble them with the cry that "the day of

the Lord was there," which would have been trying enough, even with the thought of being caught up during or after it. This the Spirit meets by intimating that the coming precedes the day, which, besides, awaits a fuller development of evil.

NOT PUT UNDER ANGELS.

Hebrews ii. 5.—There is no intimation that I can see that the world, under the old dispensation, was subjected to angels, but the statement that all things are put under the glorified man, even Jesus, already crowned, though now we see not yet all things put under Him. He is to be displayed the king of the world to come, the future habitable earth, and not of heaven merely. It is a negative statement, excluding angels, who were familiar to the Hebrew mind as the most exalted creatures known to them, from that government which pertains to the Son of Man, who had been already (in chap. i.) shown to be, in a special sense, Son of God, yea God himself, the adored of all angels, the Creator.

SOUL AND SPIRIT.

Hebrews iv. 12.—I think that, where distinguished as here, "soul" and "spirit" refer respectively to the seat of individuality and to that of capacity. Every man has both soul and spirit, and they are so linked and close that the word of God alone can rightly divide between their sometimes conflicting emotions and judgments. It judges all, searches into "the thoughts and intents of the heart." But then we have Christ as our high priest interceding for us, and maintaining us in spite of the sifting process, according to the value of His work.

EVERY FAMILY.

Ephesians iii. 15.—*πᾶσα πατρίς*.—Our translators were probably

influenced by their theological views not to follow the grammatical rule, that $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$ connected with a substantive without the article means every, not the whole. There is no doubt that "every family" is the right translation—embracing perhaps the various classes named in Heb. xii. 22, 23. And I am confident that the view thus sought to be maintained is a confusion of things that differ—all believers under every dispensation being taken together in the mass as "the church of God." But let scriptural proof be shown for the application of this term to any save the Jews and Gentiles baptized into one body between Pentecost and the Lord's second coming. The special features of "the Church," union with Christ in heaven by the Holy Ghost sent down thence consequent on His ascension—baptism of Jews and Gentiles by "one Spirit" into "one body"—the full enjoyment of the knowledge of God as "the Father"—are to be sought for in vain in either the past or future relationships of God with His earthly people Israel.

Moreover, while prizing the Psalms and other Old Testament portions of the word of God, I cannot agree that their language is equally applicable to our own position. "Now we know," says St. Paul quoting (Rom. iii.) from the Psalms, "that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law." St. Peter declares, "Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you"—the Spirit of Christ in them testified beforehand of the sufferings of Christ and the glories that should follow, *i.e.* their knowledge of the way of salvation was only prophetic—a very different thing from that which is our blessing "the Gospel preached, with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven"—the blessed witness to a fully accomplished work.

Scripture contradicts the idea that "the Spirit of adoption" indited the language of the Old Testament (see Gal. iv.); and the condition under the law is expressly contrasted (2 Cor. iii.) with "the ministration of the Spirit."

Therefore the application to ourselves of many of the sentiments of the Old Testament saints would be most inappropriate to the full position of grace in which the believer now stands. The actual manifestation of the righteousness of God on behalf of the sinner—the conscience purged by the blood of Christ—the knowledge of justification through His resurrection, and consequent “peace with God” and the clear sunshine of “no condemnation”—such truths were unknown save in measure by anticipation under the age of the law, and form part of “the ministration of the Spirit.”

MERCY.

The reason for the introduction of “mercy” to Timothy and Titus, while St. Paul simply wishes grace and peace, in addressing churches (Philemon, because of the church in his house, coming under the last head), is plain. The church, or corporate thing, is viewed in its full privileges; the individual, however favoured, recalls the thought of need day by day: “mercy” therefore is appropriate in the latter case rather than in the former.

HEAD OF HIS BODY THE CHURCH.

Colossians i. 18.—Christ only took the place of head of the church after redemption was effected, and in heavenly glory as its result, and the formation of what the Bible calls His body demanded this as a basis, and the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven as the power of its unity.

It must be borne in mind that, when Scripture speaks of the “one body,” it is in reference to the earth. It is now, and on earth, that the saints are baptized by the Holy Ghost into one body, though I am far from believing that such a relationship will cease by and by in heaven.

It is as first-born from the dead that Christ is the beginning,

even though He was from everlasting the only begotten Son, and the Eternal Life with the Father. Hence said He to Peter who had confessed Him to be the Son of the living God, "Upon this rock I will build my church." It had not yet been built or begun to be built. The foundation was not laid : it was laid afterwards in His death and resurrection.

Then ascending to heaven, He became the head, and the Holy Ghost came down in person to gather into union with Him as so risen and ascended. This and this only is what the New Testament designates His body ; for, according to the figure, there could not be a body without and before the head.

The exceedingly precious mercies of God to all saints are unquestionable ; and to some it may seem presumptuous to predicate peculiar privileges of those called since Pentecost. But, evidently, the question is one not of man's reasoning, nor of preconceived notions, but of God's word and will.

And it is plain that Ephesians and Colossians, not to speak of other Epistles, dwell much on certain blessings now conferred on the saints which never were enjoyed by, nor promised to, the Old Testament saints. They are the church's blessings brought out of God's treasury in this present dispensation, for the glory of Christ, and to show the riches of His own grace. The arguments of those who have assailed the point do not even touch the question, which they do not seem even to understand.

THE GIFT OF GOD THAT IS IN THEE.

2 Timothy i. 6.—I apprehend that the common division of "gifts" (*χαρίσματα*) into ordinary and extraordinary is unscriptural, and calculated to mislead ; for in one sense, and that a very real one, all the gifts are the affects of *χάρις*, "freely given of God," and not attained by man's labour. Scripture recognises these things as quite distinct ; first, the natural ability with its providential training, as the vessel ; secondly, the gift of grace,

which is received in due time by the chosen vessel ; and thirdly, the use of means (as prayer, the word, meditation, hearing, etc.), that the gift be stirred up, and profiting appear. No doubt, the gifts which were signs have disappeared ; but all needed for perpetuating, nourishing, and ruling the church abide "till we all come," etc.

I do not think that there is any difficulty in the apostolic communication of a *χάρισμα*, when the Lord was so pleased. There was an express prophecy so directing it in Timothy's case. In general the New Testament shows that such a channel was not necessary nor often employed, though it was sometimes in the wisdom of God. The same remark applies not merely to the *χάρισμα*, but to the *δωρεά* of the Holy Ghost (*i.e.* the Holy Ghost Himself given to believers in general). Occasionally this was associated with the imposition of apostolic hands, as in the case of Peter and John (Acts viii.), and in Paul's case (Acts xix.) But Acts ii. x., etc., are decisive that it would be an error to suppose anything of the sort to be the invariable rule. Hence, while God by times attached either the one or the other to the apostles, He maintained His own sovereignty all the while ; and certainly He has not failed either in giving the Holy Ghost or in distributing such gifts as He sees fit to continue, and this directly, now that apostles are no longer found on earth. Rom. i. 11 does not necessarily mean a ministerial gift.

GENESIS.

This first book of the Bible is the remarkable preface, as the Apocalypse is the equally striking conclusion, of the revelations of God. It presents the germ, in one form or another, of nearly all the ways of God and man, which we find separately developed in the succeeding books of Scripture ; just as the Apocalypse is the natural close, presenting the ripened fruits even for eternity of all that had been sown from the first, the ultimate results of

every intervening interference of God and of His enemy. Thus, we have in Genesis the creation of which man is chief (i.); the principles of moral relationship with God and His creatures (ii.); the temptation of Satan and his judgment by the seed of the woman; sin against God and man (and especially against Christ in type), sacrifice and worship, the world and the household of faith (iii. iv.); the heavenly and the earthly testimonies to Christ's coming (v.); the apostasy of man (vi.); God's warning by His Spirit and judgment in the deluge, with the salvation of a spared remnant in the ark, and mercy to the creature (vii.); reconciliation in its relation to the earth and not to man only (viii.); God's covenant with creation (ix.); government and the history of the present world in its early rise and progress (x. xi.); the call and promises of God, and the history of the called (xii.); the heavenly and earthly callings (xiii.); the Melchizedec priesthood (xiv.); the Jewish portion unfolded and confirmed, with the disclosure of long oppression previously from those who are to be specially judged (xv.); the typical introduction of the law or Hagar covenant (xvi.); and the intervention of God's grace sealed by circumcision, and displayed in the heir of promise (xvii.); whose further announcement is linked with the divine judgment about to fall once more, and with intercession as the due place of those who, outside the evil, enjoy communion with God (xviii.); salvation so as by fire out of the tribulation and judgment which swallow up the ungodly (xix.); failure of the faithful in maintaining their real relationship before the world (xx.); the son of promise is born, and the child of the law, according to the flesh, is cast out, followed by the world's submission instead of reproof (xxi.) Then follows the grand shadow of Christ's death, as the provision of the Father's love, and His resurrection (xxii.); the covenant form of blessing disappears (xxiii.); and the calling of the bride for the risen bridegroom ensues (xxiv.) Finally is seen the sovereign call of him, afterwards named Israel, who is identified with the sorrows,

wanderings, and ultimate blessing of that people (xxv.-l.) ; with the striking episode of his son Joseph, who is first rejected by his brethren after the flesh, and suffers yet more at the hands of the Gentiles ; next is exalted (as yet unknown to his natural kindred) to the right hand of the throne ; and lastly is owned in glory by the very brethren who had rejected him, but now owe all to his wisdom and majesty and love. Genesis is at once a book of matchless simplicity to him who glides over its surface, and of infinite depth to him who searches into the deep things of God.

THE HOPE SET BEFORE US.

Hebrews vi. 19.—“The hope set before us” is the expectation of heavenly glory as secured and displayed in Christ exalted on high. Of course, the “hope” implies something yet to be done or manifested ; though, being of God in Christ, it has not the smallest shade of uncertainty about it like what men call hope. This hope has present effects too “by the which we draw nigh to God.” (Compare Heb. x. 23, which ought to be “hope” rather than “faith,” as in the authorised version), as it ought to fill us with joy (Heb. iii. 6). It is clearly in the future alone that all will be realised, and therefore it is justly called “hope :” still the work being finished, and Christ having entered within the veil, our hope is said to penetrate there too. That is, besides being sure for us and steadfast in itself, it is heavenly as entering into the immediate presence of God on the basis of the precious blood of Christ. It counts upon God fulfilling all He has promised, according to the faithfulness which has raised up Christ from the dead (like Isaac in the type), and set Him in the atmosphere of unchangeable blessing inside the veil. As Abraham had his son given back as it were, and the promise confirmed by an oath, so have we our hopes confirmed in a yet more precious way in Christ glorified above, though still having “need of patience.”

THE TRANSITION PERIOD.

Revelation v. 9, 10.—It is one of the special objects of the Revelation, as I judge, to disclose the position and intelligent worship of the heavenly saints, after they have been gathered to the Lord in the air, and previous to His epiphany, and this in connection with the intervening judgments set forth under the seals, trumpets, and vials. Another design is to show that even in those terrible days, “the end of the age,” after the church has been caught up to meet the Lord, God will not leave Himself without a witness, but will, by His word and Spirit, commence a new work, suited to the times of special antichristian delusion. Daniel also (ch. vii.-xii.) makes known to us saints involved in these same trials, but they are, I think, Jewish saints exclusively. St. John was the appropriate instrument to reveal a larger company of holy sufferers, and that from the Gentiles, “out of every kindred,” etc. The countless multitude seen in Rev. vii. 9 *et seqq.* is out of all nations, but, as to time, restricted to “the great tribulation.” This transition period, after the rapture of the church, and before the millennium, is one of great moment, and very little understood.

SON OF GOD AND SON OF MAN.

I. The title “Son of God” is predicated of the Lord Jesus Christ in three different applications.

1. In the sense of His being born in time. This Ps. ii. sets forth: “Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee”—in connection with His kingship in Zion, presented to Israel’s responsibility at His first advent, but postponed till His second, because of their then and present unbelief. So Is. ix. 6: “Unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given.” Compare Luke i. 32: “He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest, and the Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of

his father David." And further, ver. 35: "Therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God."

2. "Son of God" as risen from the dead. Thus, Acts xiii. 33, 34, shows Jesus in these two positions; ver. 33, as raised upon earth ("again" should be omitted here, as it is in ch. iii. 22, 26, the meaning both there and here being the Messiah born in this world); ver. 34, as raised up from the dead. See also Col. i., where ver. 15 seems to refer to His birth into the world, where He necessarily was the first-born or chief of every creature, as being the Creator; and ver. 18, to His place of pre-eminence as risen, "who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead." Heb. i. 5, 6: ver. 5 speaks of Him in the first of these two positions; ver. 6, probably in the second, especially if the marginal rendering (which is most likely the correct one) be taken, which would connect His introduction into the habitable world with His second coming. Rev. i. 5 may confirm this.

3. Heb. i. 1, 2, 3, evidently speaks of our Lord as Son in the highest sense, that is, as divine. So almost everywhere in the Gospel and Epistles of St. John. "The only begotten of the Father" does not refer to His place as born on earth or risen from the dead, but expresses His eternal relationship as a divine person.

II. John v. as it shows us the Son quickening whom He will in virtue of His divine glory, so it declares that all judgment is committed to Him as Son of Man. This title refers to His assumption of that nature in which He is first rejected, and secondly exalted as universal Lord and Judge. See Ps. viii. compared with Heb. ii.; Dan. vii.; the Gospels *passim*. Hence also He is seen as "the Son of Man" in connection with the judgment of the seven churches in Rev. i. Hence cherubim as the witness of judgment were wrought on the veil, the type of His flesh.

THE PARENTHESIS IN ROMANS V.

Romans v. 12-21.—Though I cannot but dissent from those who consider this a difficult passage, it is plain that it is often misunderstood, as it is certainly momentous in its bearings.

First, I am of opinion that the parenthesis is rightly marked so as to help the sense, 13-17 inclusively being one of those full and instructive digressions so characteristic of St. Paul.

Next, be it observed, that the apostle traces sin up to its source, beyond the Jew or the law. "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all sinned." Sin was theirs through one; besides, all sinned too. It was not the law of which the Jews boasted which brought in sin; for it existed anterior to the Sinai covenant. And, though sin was not put to account, or imputed to man in God's government of the world before the law, still death reigned, the proof and wages of sin, even over those who did not transgress a known commandment like Adam (or like the Jews after the law was given). That is, while in the nature of things there might not be transgression between the two points of Adam and Moses, there was sin,¹ and God marked His sense of it, for death reigned. Now, if Adam were confessedly typical of the Messiah who was to come, should not the free gift be as the offence? For if by the offence of the one the many (the mass connected with him, who in this case were all mankind) died, much more did the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man Jesus Christ, abound unto the many. And shall not, as by one that sinned, be the gift? For the judgment was of one [thing] to condemnation, but the free gift is of many offences to justi-

¹ In 1 John iii. 4 the true force beyond a doubt is, "sin is lawlessness," and not "transgression of the law," which is a different phrase and idea. Man was corrupt and violent before the law; under the law he despised and rebelled against the authority of God. Transgression is always sin; but sin embraces much more than transgression, being the genus of which transgression is the species.

fication. For if by the offence of the one, death reigned by the one; much more shall those who receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness, reign in life by the one, Jesus Christ. This closes the parenthesis, nor could reasoning be more compressed in itself, or more conclusive to a Jew. For he, of all men, could not deny the sorrowful facts of Genesis, or the universal ruin entailed by Adam's sin. The principle then is conceded. From the beginning God had recognised something more than mere individualism. If the first and earthy man had sent down to all his family sin and death, why should not the second man, the Lord from heaven, transmit to His family righteousness and life? Verse 15 compares the persons or heads; verse 16 contrasts the things, or the judgment grounded on a single act with the state of accomplished righteousness (*δικαίωμα*) in spite of many offences; and verse 17 presents the crowning result, the evident propriety that, if by the offence of one death reigned, how much rather should the last Adam's family reign in life through their glorious head.

Then, we have the general thread resumed with light and force derived from the parenthesis, and this in the most abstract way possible. "Therefore, then (in allusion to the intervening verses, but in direct reference to verse 12), as [it was] by one offence unto all men to condemnation; so also [is it] by one accomplished righteousness unto all to justification of life. For as by the disobedience of the one man the many were constituted sinners, so also by the obedience of the one shall the many be constituted righteous." That is, verse 18 gives us the pure and simple tendency of Adam's offence on the one hand, and of Christ's righteousness on the other. The direction of the one, as of the other, was towards all men. But verse 19 adds the very important information that, whatever might be the scope of action in either case, the actual and definitive effect was a different matter. All men were not left in their ruin, nor were all, in result, delivered through Christ. Hence the change

from πάντες, to οἱ πολλοί; for it is mere ignorance to take them as equipollent. In certain circumstances they may mean the same persons, but the terms are invariably distinct in themselves. Thus, in verse 18, where "all" occurs, we have the universal aspect of the act, whether of Adam or of Christ; but in verse 19, where the positive application is treated of, we get "the many" who are in fact affected thereby.

But law did come: why it entered, and, as it were by the way, the apostle answers in verse 20. It was that (not sin, but) "the offence might abound." God forbid that anything God gave should be said to create evil! Sin being already there, the law came to bring out its real character as directly violating God's command when He gives one. "But where sin abounded, grace superabounded, in order that, as sin reigned in death, so also might grace reign, through righteousness, to eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord."

May I just say in closing, that the authorised version is clearly wrong in twice rendering εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους "upon all men"? In such a sentence it ought to be, "unto or towards all men." The distinction of εἰς and ἐπὶ strikingly appears in Rom. iii. 22; where we have, first, the universal tendency of God's righteousness, by faith of Jesus Christ, and then, the actual application of it to all those who believe. This is accurately given in our Bible, "unto all," the first and general presentation, putting all under responsibility; and then, "upon all them that believe," the special portion of all such as believe; but the distinction is lost in the same version of chap. v.

THE CHURCH.

The Holy Ghost, in the Old Testament, brings before us either individual saints or a nation as the objects of God's favour and counsels. It is of that nation (Israel) that the Spirit

uses the term "congregation" in the Old Testament, which our translators have given as the "church in the wilderness," in Acts vii. 38. But Bishop Pearson admits, as indeed every fair man must, that this is a quite distinct thing from what is called "the Church of God," etc., in the New Testament. For the Epistle to the Ephesians, with great fulness, shows that the body of Christ, God's Church, is founded on the abolition of the distinction between Jew and Gentile, and, therefore, could not be till the cross broke down the middle wall of partition. Nor could believing Jew and Gentile be builded together for an habitation of God, till the Spirit came down in a fuller way than before, as the fruit of Christ's victory and ascension on high, where He took the new place of Head of the Church (not merely of King in Zion). When will they understand that this was an entirely new work of God, and that Scripture gives to this new assembly of believing Jews and Gentiles (bonded together by the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven in the name of Jesus) the name of "the Church of God"? It is not merely that the term "Church of God" is never, in the sense now spoken of, applied to the Old Testament saints; but the state of things could not be before Christ's death and resurrection as the basis, and the Holy Spirit's personal presence (not influence, gifts, etc., merely) as the power of this unity. It is founded on Christ exalted in heaven, after having accomplished redemption; and it is formed by that operation of the Spirit which not only quickens but unites Jewish and Gentile saints now to Christ in heaven and to each other on earth as one body.

Now, indubitably, such was not the case in the wilderness, nor in the promised land: Jew and Gentile, whether believing or not, were rigorously severed by Divine command, and the saints were sustained by a promised Messiah, instead of resting on the accomplished work of a Saviour. Life, of course, divine life, they had through faith, else they would not have been saints. But there was no such thing as union with a glorified Head in

heaven. Nay, it did not exist even when our Lord was upon earth. The disciples had faith and life, but they were forbidden to go to the Gentiles, instead of being united to them, till Christ rose from the dead. But the moment the Spirit came down, consequent on Christ's exaltation above, the various tongues proclaimed God's grace to the Gentiles as well as Jews ; and for the first time we read of "the Church," in the full and proper sense, as now subsisting on earth (see Acts ii.) Christ had now begun to fulfil His promise, "Upon this rock I will build my Church." How could this mean the old assembly which fell in the wilderness ? It was a new and future building. No point is evaded, as indeed there was no temptation ; for the truth on this subject is clear and certain, though I do not expect to convince every one. What I have remarked in this paper spares me the need of replying to what is urged now, which is altogether beside the mark. The only thing of the least shadow of weight is Acts vii. 38, which has been fully explained (1 Cor. x.), and proves that Israel was typical of us. How does that show that they and we form "one body" ? Christ was the Lamb fore-ordained before the foundation of the world (not slain from it). How does this prove that believing Jew and Gentile formed one body of old, as unquestionably they do now ?

P.S.—The author of a paper (on Col. i. 18) admits much, too much I think, to allow of a long or successful resistance to the rest. He allows that the "scriptural proofs of the peculiar blessings belonging to the Church, since" what he terms "its Pentecostal formation," are convincing ; but he seems to conceive that the Old Testament saints may have had those privileges extended to them also, though in the separate state and removed from earth to heaven. He does not pretend to cite Scripture for this very imaginative mode of embodying the Old Testament saints in the Church, which I apprehend will satisfy those who oppose my views as little as myself. He tries to make it out by the illustration of the French empire, established after some distant

colony was formed, and then granting its imperial advantages to the colonists. But the answer is plain. Scripture, in presenting to our faith the groups of glory, distinguishes the spirits of just men made perfect (*i.e.* in resurrection) from the Church of the first-born. There is no such thought there as merging all in one ; whereas a positive decree of the emperor would be needful to make good the claims of the colonists. Ps. lxxviii. 18 does not refer to departed saints, but to Christ's triumph over the evil spirits who had previously led His people captive.

Another writer has referred to Rom. xi. and Gal. iii. in proof that the Church actually existed as such in Old Testament times. But this is evidently to confound things that differ, because the inheritance of the Abrahamic promises, of which their chapters treat, is not identical with the enjoyment of the Church's privileges ; whereas their identity is assumed in the argument. It is allowed that the New Testament saints do inherit those promises, but that is an essentially different thing from the blessings revealed, *e.g.*, in the Ephesians. The olive is not the heavenly church but the earthly tree of promise and testimony, of which the Jews were the natural branches. Instead of the broken-off unfaithful branches, Gentiles are now grafted in ; but, on their unfaithfulness, excision is the sure threat of God, and the Jews will again be brought into their own olive tree ; *i.e.* for the millennial inheritance. This is the plain teaching of Rom. xi. ; and though as Gentiles we may be grafted in, and as individuals we may be Abraham's seed, the special position of Christ's body, as made known in 1 Corinthians, Ephesians, Colossians, etc., is too distinct to require argumentation. When "the body" is spoken of there is no cutting off nor grafting in. There is in it neither Jew nor Gentile. All is above nature there.

WHO SHALL "CONFIRM COVENANT"?

Daniel ix. 27.—I believe that it is impossible legitimately to connect the death of the Messiah with the covenant confirmed with the mass, or many, for one week (*i.e.* 7 years) in this passage, and that for several reasons:—

First, The Messiah was already regarded as "cut off" at the close of a previous division of the weeks, viz. after the first $7 + 62 = 69$ weeks, or 483 years.

Secondly, The disastrous end of the city and the sanctuary is supposed to have come before the seventieth week begins. (Compare the conclusion of verse 26.) After the Messiah was cut off and before the last week, it will be noticed by the careful reader that there is an interval of indefinite length, filled up by the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, and a course of war and desolation which is not yet terminated.

Thirdly, After all this comes the last, or seventieth week, which has to do with "the beast" as clearly as the first 69 weeks bring us down to Christ's death, the interruption of the chain being left room for, and supplied, in the latter part of verse 26.

Fourthly, It is clear that when the Messiah has been cut off, another personage is spoken of "as the prince that shall come," whom it is absurd to confound with the Messiah, because it is *his people* who ravage the Jewish city and sanctuary; that is, it is a Roman prince, and not the promised Head of Israel.

Fifthly, As this future prince of the Romans is the last person spoken of, it is most natural, unless adequate reasons appear to the contrary, to consider that verse 27 refers to him, and not to the slain Messiah: "and he shall confirm covenant" (not "the" covenant, as the margin shows).

Sixthly, This is remarkably strengthened by the time for which the covenant is made, namely, for seven years, which has, in my opinion, no sense if applied to anything founded on the Lord's death, but exactly coincides with the two periods of the

earlier, and the later half-weeks, during which the Roman beast acts variously in the Apocalypse.

Seventhly, It is yet more fortified by the additional fact, that when half the time of this covenant expires, "He shall cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease," just as might be gathered from Rev. xi. and other Scriptures.

THE SEVEN PARABLES.

Matthew xiii.—The connection between these several parables is asked. It will be observed that they are in all seven, the number of spiritual completeness in good or evil. (See Leviticus and the Revelation *passim*.) Next, it is manifest that the first differs from the rest, inasmuch as it is not a likeness of the kingdom of heaven, which the following six are. Further, of these six, three were said (beside the "sower") to the multitude outside, as well as the disciples; the last three to the disciples alone, within the house. All this bears upon the true interpretation, not as deciding but confirming it. For the first parable is evidently general, if it do not particularly refer to our Lord's personal ministry on earth, before the kingdom of heaven was introduced by His ascension. It is not here the heir sent to receive the fruit of the vineyard; Jesus is "a sower;" and His sowing is hindered and opposed by the world, the flesh, and the devil, as we find in the explanation (verses 19-22), though a portion of the seed takes root in good ground.

The three public comparisons of the kingdom of heaven follow,—the wheat and tare field, the mustard seed, and the leaven. The sower here is still the Son of man; but it is His work from heaven (just as in Mark xvi. 20; Ephes. ii. 17). It is the kingdom of Christ when rejected by the Jews; of Christ absent, not present in visible power and glory. It is the kingdom of heaven on earth, entrusted to servants, who, alas! are soon asleep, and the devil sows his wicked children in the midst of

the true children of the kingdom. The general teaching then is, that the new dispensation, as far as man's responsibility was concerned, would see ruin introduced by the enemy, which nothing could remedy but the judgment executed at the end of the age. But this is not all. Christendom would grow from a diminutive beginning into a "tree," emblematic of a towering earthly power, which would even shelter the instruments of Satan (compare verses 4 and 19 with 32). Nor this only : for a system of doctrine, nominally at least Christian, should spread over a certain defined mass, till the whole was leavened. Whether this mixture, this worldly aggrandisement, this propagation of (not life or truth, but) profession, such as it was, were of the Lord or His enemy, must be gathered not merely from hints here, but from Scripture generally.

Then, upon the dismissal of the multitude, the Lord explains the chief of the first three similitudes of the kingdom, and adds three more, which develope not its external appearances, but its internal aspects to the spiritual man. Treasure hid in the field, the pearl, and the drag-net, comprehend these further instructions. Christ buys the field for the sake of the treasure, His own that He loved in the world. This, nevertheless, did not fully tell out either His love or their beauty in His eyes. Therefore, as it seems to me, the parable of the pearl follows,— "one pearl of great price," the unity and the peerless charms of that object in the Lord's eyes, for which He gave up "all that He had," as Messiah, here below ; yea, life itself. The net evidently presents the closing circumstances of the kingdom, as to which I would briefly call attention to two facts often confounded, that the fishermen gather the good into vessels, casting the bad away, while the angels at the consummation sever the wicked from among the just. Our part is to take forth the precious from the vile ; theirs will be to separate the vile from the precious. Grace in man occupies itself with "the good." It will be the judicial task of the angels to deal with the wicked, and to leave "the just" as the nucleus for the Lord's glory in the millennial earth.

THE HEAVENLY CALLING.

Hebrews iii.—It is of no small moment to bear in mind that, while the “heavenly calling,” as a developed system, depends on the ascension of the Lord Jesus Christ into heaven, the faith of Old Testament believers was far in advance of their calling and circumstances. Thus, the Lord called Abram from his country and kindred and father’s house to a land that He would show him ; and it was certainly by faith that he obeyed and went out, not knowing whither he went. But Heb. xi. 9 shows us the further action of faith ; for when he got to the land he sojourned in it as in a strange country, because a ray of the distant heavenly glory had dawned on his soul. “He looked for a city which hath foundations,” etc. Thus he and the other patriarchs died, as they lived, in faith, not in actual possession. Nevertheless, such strangership as this neither amounts to nor implies the “heavenly calling.” Doubtless, the “heavenly calling” now produces and enjoins strangership also ; but this in no way proves that itself was published and enjoyed of old.

For the “heavenly calling,” brought before us in Hebrews, grew out of the position of the Lord as having appeared, and when He had by Himself purged our sins, as having sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high. Hence the earthly tabernacle and the rest in the land, and the Levitical priesthood and sacrifices entirely disappear, for the partakers of the heavenly calling who are addressed in the epistle. This state of things was not true either of the fathers or the children of Israel. Their hope was intimately bound up with the land (no doubt, under the Messiah and a glorified condition, but still their land and people as the medium of blessing for all others) ; but the “heavenly calling” was not revealed, nor could be till He came whose rejection led to it, and whose redemption and consequent glorification in heaven became its basis. Hence

Abram had his earthly altar. Hence he sacrificed, as did his descendants, in due season, of the flock, or the herd, or the appointed clean birds. Then comes the worldly sanctuary and its most instructive furniture and rites, that spoke of better things looming in the future. Nobody that I know disputes that individual saints saw beyond these shadows, dimly perhaps but really, to a coming Saviour and a heavenly country. Still the land to which the patriarchs were called was an earthly land, and the entire polity of Israel was that of a nation governed under the eye of a God who displayed Himself on earth in their midst—in contrast with “the heavenly calling,” of which not the less it furnished striking types, *mutatis mutandis*. Accordingly, in Heb. xi., after having traced the precious individual traits of the Spirit in the Old Testament saints, not only from Abraham but from Abel downwards, we are guarded against the error that would merge all in one lump, by the incidental statement of the last verse. (See also chap. xii. 23.) The elders have not received the promise ; they are waiting till the resurrection for that. Meanwhile God has provided unforeseen some better thing for us. He has given us not promise only but accomplishment in Christ. He has made us worshippers once purged, having no more conscience of sins. He calls us boldly to enter into the holiest by a new and living way consecrated for us. None of these things could be so predicated of them, and yet these things are but a part of the heavenly calling. Truly, then, has God provided some better thing for us, even if we only look at what is now made known through the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven. It is also true that they without us shall not be made perfect. They and we shall enter on our respective portion in resurrection glory at the coming of Christ. Meanwhile we have no earthly calling, nothing but an heavenly one.

So far is it from being true that the early ecclesiastical writers erred by distinguishing too sharply between the dis-

pensations, that their main characteristic is Judaising the church by denying the real differences. Jerome did this no less than others, even to the confounding of Christ's ministry with Jewish priesthood. —

WHAT THE CHURCH CONSISTS OF.

If certain views as to what "the church" consists of are asked to be clearly stated, I cannot better fulfil this request than by giving the following extracts from a writer deeply versed in these subjects :—

The Word of God presents to us a church formed on earth by the power of the Holy Ghost come down from heaven when the Son of God sat down there in glory, having accomplished the work of redemption. This church is one with its Head ; it is the body whereof Christ, ascended on high and seated on the right hand of God, is the Head. (Eph. i. 20-23 ; ii. 14-22 ; iii. 5-6 ; iv. 4-16 ; 1 Cor. xii. 12, 13 ; John xii. 32, xi. 52.) The same Spirit, who, by the means of those whom God chose, had called sinners and communicated life to them, has also united them in one body, whose Head is the glorified Christ, and of which the Spirit Himself is the bond with Christ, and in which He serves as the bond between the members one with another. The church, then, is a body subsisting in unity here below, formed by the power of God, who gathers His children in union with Christ its Head ; a body which derives its existence and unity from the work and presence of the Holy Ghost come down from heaven as the consequence of the ascension of Jesus. What is described in Ephesians, and defined as the church, is a state of things impossible to exist before the death and resurrection of Christ as its basis, and the presence of the Holy Ghost as its formative and maintaining power. Any definition we could give of it, according to Ephesians, supposes these two things. The Spirit of God, there, treats Jews and Gentiles as alike children of wrath, speaks of the middle wall of partition broken down by the cross of Jesus, the actual exaltation of Jesus above all principality and power, and us raised and exalted with Him ; and both Jew and Gentile reconciled in one new man, in one body by the cross, and builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit ; so that there is one body and one Spirit. It is declared, consequently, that "now unto principalities and powers in heavenly places is made known by the Church the manifold wisdom of God." There are two great truths dependent on this doctrine : the church united to Christ in glory

accomplished hereafter ; and meanwhile, as far as existing or developed on earth, the habitation of God through the Spirit. This is its calling, of which it is to walk worthy ; a calling clearly impossible from its very nature, till the descent of the Holy Ghost made it such an habitation.

That the saints will all be gathered into everlasting blessedness as partaking of Christ as their life, and redeemed by His blood, according to the counsels of God, and conformed to the image of His Son, is owned. They are all redeemed by blood, and all quickened by divine life. But the doctrine insisted on is this : that, Christ having broken down the middle wall of partition by His death, and ascended up on high, and sat down on the right hand of God, and thus presented the full efficacy of His work in the presence of God, the Holy Ghost has come down and united believers in one body, thus united to Christ as one body ; which body is in Scripture designated the Church, or assembly of God, and is His habitation through the Spirit. In this, as founded on the risen and exalted Saviour, and united to Him, as seen on high, by the Holy Ghost, there is neither Jew nor Greek. Christ, as exalted, is entirely above these distinctions ; Jew or Greek are alike brought nigh, as having been children of wrath, by the blood of that cross by which the middle wall of partition has been broken down. Hitherto God had saved souls. At Pentecost He gathered His children into the assembly on earth ; He added daily to the Church such as should be saved. It is no longer salvation merely, nor even the kingdom. God begins to form His Church here below (Acts ii).

To make the Church a company of believing Jews, with Gentiles added to them, and Abraham's seed their proper definition, entirely shuts out this divine teaching, because the position given to the Church in Ephesians entirely precludes their being looked at as Jews ; and the character of "Abraham's seed" comes in merely to show they are true heirs of promise, because they are Christ's, who is the seed of Abraham and Heir of the promises. But, most clearly, this is altogether the lower ground on which to speak of Christ, in comparison with His glorious exaltation at the right hand of God, on which the Church as such is founded. . . . No one can read the Ephesians attentively without seeing that the Church, as one body existing on earth, though heavenly in privilege and character, takes its place consequent on the work of the cross, the exaltation of Jesus to the right hand of God, and the coming down of the Holy Ghost. Hence to give any definition of the Church which implies its existence (other than in the counsels of God), which speaks of its existence on earth (*e.g.* during the life of Christ on earth, or previous to His exaltation and the descent of the Holy Ghost), denies its nature, and sets aside its character. . . . Those who compose the Church have other relation-

ships besides. They are children of Abraham. . . . But these latter characters do not weaken what has been stated, much less do they annul it. . . . 1 Cor. xii. describes the Church . . . as one body on earth. So Eph. i. iv. ; Col. i. ii. . . . While then one would sympathise with the godly dread some may feel at anything which seems to affect the salvation of all saints from the beginning, and the electing love of God in respect of them, it is well, on the other hand, to call things by their right, *i.e.* scriptural, names. The Spirit of God is infinitely wiser than man, and our business is to see, follow, and admire His wisdom, as in other matters, so here. He has restricted the title "Church of God," in a New Testament sense, to those who are baptized with the Holy Ghost.

Such is a brief exposition of the views in question, which, to my mind, carry scriptural proof along with them. But what I contend is, that the view which makes the church of God embrace believers in all dispensations is wholly devoid of such proof. It is in vain to reason, against the plainest and fullest testimony of God's word, that "all saints are equally and similarly justified by faith . . . alike called saints . . . the names of all written in one book, the Book of Life." These similarities, which are not denied, are by no means inconsistent with the place of the church as the body and bride of Christ. But when it is pronounced that "the new Covenant Church" (a term not found in Scripture) "has no higher place assigned it than participating in the blessings of faithful Abraham," the entire teaching of Scripture, above referred to (in Eph., Col., etc.) is set aside. It really then becomes a question of spiritual intelligence, if not worse. This objection is ignorance of or opposition to Scripture.

As to Heb. xii. 22, 23, we must adopt not only with some of the best critics, but with the most ancient versions, as the Syriac, Vulgate, etc., the punctuation *καὶ μυρίασιν, ἀγγέλων πανηγύρει, καὶ ἐκκλησίᾳ, πρ. κ. τ. λ.* It is confessedly required by the structure of the whole portion of which every paragraph is commenced by *καί*. So that the attempt to make this passage show "the general assembly" and "the church" as identical is a failure.

No doubt we read of "the church in the wilderness." But ἐκκλησία simply means an "assembly" or "congregation." In Acts xix. 32, 39, 41, the confused meeting of the Ephesians cannot mean the church of God, yet it is called ἡ ἐκκλησία. So "the church in the wilderness" ought rather to have been "the assembly" there. It means, unquestionably, not the church of God, but the congregation of Israel, almost all of whose carcasses fell in the wilderness, and to whom God swore that they should not enter into His rest. It is said again: "Besides, He was slain from the foundation of the world." A comparison of this passage (Rev. xiii. 8) with Rev. xvii. 8, where the same persons and circumstances are referred to, makes it evident that "from the foundation of the world" should be connected, not with "the Lamb slain," but with "the names written in the book of life." It is thus plain that the arguments, whether of one adversary or of another, have no weight when examined. And yet they are among the principal ones against the view which, in my opinion, Scripture so plainly sets forth, viz. that the body of believers, gathered from the day of Pentecost until the time when Christ shall come to take His heavenly people to Himself, has, while sharing many fundamental blessings with all the redeemed, a distinct calling and privileges of its own, and alone has the title assigned to it of "the church of God" or Christ's body.

"ALL THEY THAT BE IN ASIA."

2 Timothy i. 15.—Are these all the Asian saints absolutely, or are they only the few that had been at Rome, and had shown this cowardice towards St. Paul,—that they had failed to identify themselves with him, and his testimony and circumstances? Clearly the latter: and the way of speaking of them used by the apostle (οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ) is likely due to the fact that these Asian Christians were home again in Asia when Paul wrote to Timothy about their neglect of him when they were in Rome; and that Timothy, to whom he wrote, was then in Asia also.

It is rather too wide a conclusion to come to, that all the Christians in Asia had turned away from Paul. The fickleness of the Galatians would warrant us in looking for a good deal of turning away from Paul in Asia ; but this passage gives no countenance to the incredible notion that the whole of the Asian saints had given up Paul. The fact of Phygellus and Hermogenes being mentioned as two of them, shows that they were only a few. And again, the praise of Onesiphorus (an Asian), in the same connection, for seeking him out very diligently and finding him, and not being ashamed of his chain, points pretty plainly to the circumstances of the apostle as the cause of their repudiation of him, and that the scene of their so doing had been Rome. He says in effect : The Asians all shunned me when here ; but instead of being ashamed of me, or repudiating me, Onesiphorus sought me out with more than ordinary diligence, and found me. 2 Tim. i. 8 shows that this was the purport of the apostle's meaning. "Be not thou therefore ashamed of the testimony of our Lord, nor of me His prisoner ; but be thou partaker of the afflictions of the gospel according to the power of God."

" THEY DID EAT AND DRINK."

Exodus xxiv. 11.—Does this mean, as some make it, that they enjoyed a feast with Jehovah ? " Also they saw God, and did eat and drink," means nothing more than this,—they lived ; they were not struck down dead. It was expected that no one could see God and not die. " Manoah said unto his wife, We shall surely die, because we have seen God" (Judges xiii. 22). What was the origin of this thought ? The conviction that man, as he is, is so unfit for God's presence, that to see God must be death to man. The death and resurrection of Him who became man and died for us is meant to deliver the believer from such a feeling. He is indeed dead and risen with Him.

EPISTOLARY COMMUNICATIONS.

TABERNACLE, COVENANT, AND PUTTING AWAY SIN.

HEB. IX.

Ottawa, America, Oct. 27th, 1876.

MY DEAR BROTHER I write at once as to Heb. ix. Διὰ is used for a state or condition, which affects the principle on which we act or receive anything, on which anything takes place. Thus, Rom. iv. 11, δι' ἀκροβυστίας; Rom. ii. 27, διὰ γράμματος καὶ περιτομῆς. So it is in Heb. ix. 11. As to παραγόμενος, though it be having come, it is not the act of coming εἰρχομαι, but being present in or for something by coming; coming into a certain condition, so that He is there, or come in view of what is to be done when arrived. The verb in the sentence is εἰσῆλθεν ἐφάπαξ, verse 12. He had taken the position of High Priest of coming good things; and this office was to be fulfilled, not in the present earthly tabernacle, but in a greater and more perfect one. The tabernacle is not, therefore, I think, the incarnation, for His priesthood (save the fact of atonement) was not on earth; it is exercised in connection with heavenly things, though there securing earthly ones for Israel. παραγόμενος is entering into the condition of priesthood, not incarnation or glory, and that is connected with the heavenly tabernacle. The fact of His going in is in 24 as in 12; this referring to eternal redemption, which He had found; that, to the fact of His abiding presence before God there for us; but in both εἰσέρχομαι, the act of going in, not παραγίνομαι, what He had come to be or do, the condition entered into or in view. I do not consider διὰ αἵματος, or τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος as instru-

mental, but to be used in the sense already referred to. The end of the ages, or consummation of the ages, are all the dealings of God with man to test his general condition. In this general sense the state of innocence comes in ; but the proper connection is what is after the fall, yet not looking at man as lost, but testing his state and whether he was recoverable, or was lost and had to be saved. Without law ; under law ; God manifested in the flesh, were the great features of this. Hence in John xii. the Lord says, "Now is the judgment of this world." Though there was testimony, there were no religious institutions before the flood, unless the fact of sacrifices. There were after : government, promises to Abraham, showing it was grace to one separated from an idolatrous world and head of a new race, the law, the prophets, and at last the Son as come, not as offered. Then God laid the foundation of His own purposes in righteousness.

The difference is that in John i. 29 it is the sin of *the world*, in Heb. ix. it is to put away sin more generally. Neither will have full accomplishment till the new heavens and the new earth. In this last passage we have to distinguish between it and bearing the sins of many. The last concerns us, and purging our conscience. I do not think it has been adequately seen how all good and evil has been brought to an issue in the cross—in that place of sin before God, that is, in Christ made sin (though in the last words it is for us, 2 Cor. v. 21). We have the absolute wickedness of man and enmity against God in goodness ; the complete power of Satan, "your hour and the power of darkness ;" the prince of this world leading all men, the disciples having fled ; man in his absolute perfection, in whom that prince had nothing, but there was perfect love to the Father and perfect obedience, man in absolute perfection, and that as made sin before God, where it was needed for God's glory. For it was where He was made sin that the obedience was made perfect, obedient unto death ; God absolute in righteousness against sin, and perfect in love to the sinner. This, therefore, is the finished

and so immutable ground of eternal perfectness. We cannot say as to the result sin is actually put away, save for us (2 Cor. v.) who by the Holy Ghost know it ; but the work is perfectly done on the ground of which there will be a new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness. We must not confound "sin" and "sins." He has borne the sins of many (they never can be remembered against us) ; loved and washed from them in His own blood : our conscience, once purged, is made clean for ever. But sin is that alienation of all things, and first of all of our hearts, from God, which requires reconciliation of things in heaven and earth, which is not yet, and of ourselves which is ; see Col. i. 20, 21, and many confirmatory passages. Christ then has been manifested for the total abolition of sin out of heaven and earth, defilement and alienation gone, besides *our* guilt being atoned for and our sins remitted ; but both are by His sacrifice, in which God withal has been perfectly glorified in all that He is. The result is not yet wholly accomplished, nor will be fully till the new heavens and the new earth. The *καταχθόνια* of Phil. are another thing ; they bow but are not reconciled. I say this to avoid mistakes. The burnt-offering alone took the ground of sin, the sin-offering of sins. Romans also, i. 17-v. 11, treats of sins ; v. 12-end of viii. of sin only, here only as to man on the earth. *φέρειν* is as to sins, *ἀγών* goes on to sin. Sins are borne, sin put away. Of course *our* sins are wholly taken away, but that is "*our*." He is never said to have borne the *sins* of all or of the world, or taken them away, but our sins, or those of many ; but He is the *ἀγών* of sin out of the universe, the taker-away of it, the result being not yet accomplished. *εἰς ἀθέτησιν* is the result proposed, *ἡθέτησε* is not said. The work is done, the full result not yet brought about ; but it is all in virtue of that, though power comes in to make it good, just as it does in the micro-cosm of ourselves, even as to the body in due time.

As to the question of "covenant" or "testament" : "covenant" is always right, save in Heb. ix. 16, 17. Even here it

THE RANSOM MONEY.

367

has been contested; but it seems more simple to take it as "testament," an observation or allusion by the by, διαθήκη being in Greek covenant or testament or disposition. The voice of τοῦ διαθεμένου has been the great bone of contention where it has been discussed; translated, if covenant, "the appointed" [sacrifice]. But this has seemed to me forced. Some have even made Gal. iii. 15, 16 "testament," but this, I judge, is entirely wrong.

THE RANSOM MONEY.

Boston, U.S., January 1877.

MY DEAR BROTHER—I have read the *Lösepenningen* of Dr. Waldenström. I had previously read his Latin thesis on the Lutheran symbolical books. There he was all right in combating the common error that Christ's work changed God's mind, and that God was then but a Judge, and practically that love was in Christ, and only judgment in God, as if the work of Christ procured His love. I have very often insisted on the truth as to this. You have both sides in John iii. 14, 15. But he drops out "the Son of MAN must," and holds only that "God gave His Son." And thus it is a very wrong production. Still the error that is in it arises from having got hold of the love, and so getting onesided. The interpretation of the passage is all wrong, but that is not so material; but he confounds purchasing and redemption. If what he says means anything, all sins of all men are put away.

Dr. W. is also careless in his use of Scripture. He contradicts himself; for though sins are blotted out the curse abides on sinners continually. Wrath and the curse remain for those who are sinners, yet there was no wrath in God! The justified are taken from under the curse; but they had been under it then it appears, and, in their sins, were under the wrath of God and condemnation. He mixes up all this confusion and contradiction with just refutation of errors. And note, What did Christ suffer and be forsaken of God for? It is all well to say God's love gave

Him, and that was the source of all. No doubt. But why did Christ suffer as He did? why had He the stripes? He is a propitiation, an *ἱλασμός*, He suffered *ἰλάσκεισθαι*. God had not to be reconciled, but His righteous holy nature required the sin to be put away. Then he uses "we" and "us" in the mouth of believers, as if it was all the world. His doctrine as to not living under law and experience is dangerous. I resist looking to experience as much as he does; but, in citing the lost sheep and the father of the prodigal, he has dropped the return of the prodigal, so carefully brought out in detail by the Lord to make the difference between conversion and salvation clear. I reject utterly self-examination for peace; but a soul will have to know itself—not merely its sins forgiven, but that "in me, that is in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing." He resists reconciling God, in which he is right. But he has neglected one side of Scripture truth; has quoted Scripture without heed; and contradicts himself. It is confusion of redemption and purchase that has made all his doctrine wrong. Christ is an *ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων*: but that which is the strongest statement is very different from *ἀπολύτρωσις*. It is a pity he could not be set straight, for the point of departure of his mind is just: but he has followed it out hastily, not weighing Scripture. He has lost the *ἱλασμός* side of the work, and this is dangerous. It has not gone to denying that the sins had to be put away, and therefore has thrown all his teaching into confusion. The blood of the goat was presented to God on the mercy-seat, and Christ is entered in not without blood; why if it were not needed to *ἰλάσκεισθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ*? Why was it presented to God? Not surely to change His mind or make Him love (a horrid thought), but needed for His righteousness and holy nature. It became Him in bringing many sons to glory. So He says to Israel, When I see the blood, I will pass over. There is wrath and the curse he admits—why? and what met it so that it should not be executed on us? Hence He always confounds God and the

Father, making us all His children. "God so loved the world." It is never said "the Father" loved the world. The Father is a name of relationship with His children, not with the world. Dr. W. admits they are not all saved. The question is not, Did Christ undertake a partial restoration? but, Did He undertake the *restoration* of all? He died for all, I believe, but that is a very different thing. Here you have purchase and redemption as the same, and their perfect restoration the same as He undertook. All this is confusion and mist. He is wrong even in saying purchase is always spoken of *all*. In 1 Cor. vi. 20 and vii. 23 it is not so; and 2 Peter ii. 1 is quite another thought, and so is Matt. xiii. 44, where the field is clearly bought to have the treasure. There are two other cases in Rev. where it is distinctly not all, and *περιποιούμαι*, where the same is true. I cannot find one passage where it is all. To state that it is so always is not careful.

FOUR CHARACTERISTIC FEATURES OF A CHRISTIAN.

DEAR BROTHER—I have been interested just lately by what is written in Eph. iv. 30, v. 1-3, and send you a few thoughts on it. A Christian in apostolic days was sealed by the Holy Spirit of God, and he knew it. He was forgiven of God, and he was conscious of it. He shared in the love of Christ, and was sensible of it. He was a saint of God, and was reminded of it. Very great were these favours, and for the most part very wonderful; yet each of them could furnish ground on which to base most practical exhortations for every-day life. Sealed by the Holy Spirit of God, the Christian was not to grieve Him. Forgiven of God in Christ, they were to forgive one another. Loved by Christ, they were to walk in love. As saints, they were to refrain even from the naming among themselves of those unclean ways by which men are so often defiled. Their being thus exhorted showed into what, unless watchful, they might fall. The terms, however, in which they were addressed, proved

that they never could be lost. For God had forgiven them, and they were sealed by the Spirit unto the day of redemption.

THE FIRST-BORN OF EVERY CREATURE.

WHAT is the exact meaning of "first-born of every creature," *πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως*, Col. i. 15?

In a new translation it is said, "it is not each individual as such, but of everything called *κτίσις* in its nature (compare Heb. ix. 11). 'Creature' individually is *κτίσμα*." This settles it as against the querist if that passage had been in his mind.

But Meyer says [on *πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως*] after the relation of Christ to *God*, now follows His relation to *what is created*, in an apologetic interest of opposition to the Gnostic false teachers. . . The false teachers denied to Christ the supreme unique rank in the order of spirits. But He is *first-born of every creature*, that is, born before every creature—*having come to personal existence*, entered upon subsistent being, *ere yet anything created was extant* (Rom. i. 25, viii. 39; Heb. iv. 13). Analogous, but not equivalent, is Prov. viii. 22, *f*.

In a note as against Hoffmann he says that this expression "posits the origin of Christ (as *λόγος προφορικός*) in His *temporal* relation to the creature; and this point is the more purely to be adhered to, seeing that Christ Himself does not belong to the category of the *κτίσις*."

Then, in the text, he proceeds—"It is to be observed that this predicate [first-born] also belongs to the *entire* Christ, inasmuch as by His exaltation His entire person is raised to that state in which He, as to His divine nature, had already existed before the creation of the world," etc. "The mode in which he (Paul) conceived of the personal pre-existence of Christ before the world, as regards (timeless) origin, is not defined by the figurative *πρωτότοκος* more precisely than as *procession* from the

Divine nature, whereby the pre-mundane Christ became subsistent, ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ and Ἰσα Θεῶ (Phil. ii. 6).

The genitive πάσης κτίσεως, moreover, is not the *partitive* genitive (although De Wette still, with Usteri, Reuss, and Baur, holds this to be indubitable), because the anarthrous πᾶσα κτίσις does not mean *the whole creation*, or *everything which is created* (Hoffmann), and consequently cannot affirm the *category* or *collective whole* to which Christ belongs as its first-born individual (it means *every creature*: compare on πᾶσα οἰκοδομή, Eph. ii. 21); but it is the genitive of comparison, corresponding to the superlative expression, "*the first-born in comparison with every creature*," that is, *born earlier* than every creature.

In a note he says against Hoffmann—"The interpretation of H. is incorrect, because there would thereby be necessarily affirmed a *homogeneous* relation of origin for Christ and all the κτίσις." "H. opines that πάσης κτίσεως is simply genitive of, 'of the definition of relation' (e.g., 'in relation to all that is created, Christ occupies the position which a first-born has towards the household of his father')." "But this" (continues Meyer) "explains *nothing*, because the question remains, *What* relation is meant to be defined by the genitive? The πρωτότοκος πᾶσης κτίσεως is not at all to be got over so easily as it is by Hoffmann, namely, with a grammatically erroneous explanation of the anarthrous πᾶσα κτίσις, and with appeal to Ps. lxxxix. 22 (where in fact, πρωτότοκος stands without *genitive*, and בְּנוֹרָה in the sense of the first *rank*."

"The genitive here is to be taken quite as the comparative genitive with πρῶτος (see on John i. 15, etc.) The *element of comparison* is the relation of *time* (πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον εἶναι, John xvii. 5), and that in respect of *origin*. But because the latter in the case of every κτίσις is *different* from what it is in the case of Christ . . . the term πρωτότοκος is chosen, which, in comparison as to the time of origin, points to the peculiar *nature* of the origination in the case of *Christ*, namely, that He was not

created by God like the other beings in whom this is implied in the designation *κτίσις*, but *born*, having come forth homogeneous from the nature of God.

“And by this is expressed, not a relation homogeneous with the *κτίσις* (Holtzmann), a relation *kindred to the world*, but that which is absolutely exalted above the world, and unique. . . .

“At variance, therefore, with the words is the Arian interpretation that Christ is designated as *the first creature*. With this view the sequel also conflicts, which describes Christ as the accomplisher and aim of creation; hence in His case a mode of origin higher and different from *the being created* must be pre-supposed, which is, in fact, characteristically indicated in the purposely-chosen word *πρωτότοκος*. . . . If the creation of all things took place in Christ, it is evident that He must stand *before* the series of created things, and be *πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως*.”

So far Meyer, the best of all the German critics of the Greek text. What say you to it?

Do you think *ἔκων* and *πρωτότοκος* refer to Christ in His divine nature, or in incarnation?

See also Dr. J. B. LIGHTFOOT'S “Colossians,” pp. 210-216, for an historical sketch of the interpretation. Augustine and Pelagius, he says, held both to be expressions of the Incarnate Christ. The “Fathers” did so generally to meet the Arians. And Marcellus went into error, making it all the moral creation, and applying the term to the whole context.

Dr. LIGHTFOOT'S notes are copious, and his discussion contains much valuable information; but he does not very distinctly tell us what he thinks, though I gather that he regards both expressions of Christ's divine nature.

OLSHAUSEN says: “In verses 15-17 Christ is delineated without reference to His incarnation.” Again: “He (the Son of God) must have been born of the substance of the Father before all the creation, *for* all things are created in Him.”

Bp. ELLICOTT will have it everything that is created, not the

whole creation, "begotten, and that antecedently to everything that was created." "He disdains not to institute a *temporal* comparison between His own generation from eternity and their creation in time." He admits in a very secondary and *inferential* sense priority in dignity, "the genitive of the *point of view*."

ALFORD suggests that the safe method is to combine the two ideas of priority and dignity—"that Christ was not only first-born of His mother in the world, but first-begotten of His Father before the worlds, and that He holds the rank, as compared with every created thing, of first-born in dignity. For, etc., v. 16, where this assertion is justified."

THEODORET: "Not as having creation for a sister, but as begotten before all creation."

CHRYSOSTOM: "Not significant of glory and honour, but only of time."

BRAUNE: "Since *πάσης* denotes every kind of creature, angels and men, Christ existed before all. He does not begin the series of a category as 'first-begotten of the dead' (Rev. i. 5) 'among many brethren' (Rom. viii. 29), but He is antecedent, conditioning the creation."

This is the reply which the sending of the foregoing has elicited from a friend:—

"I believe that Meyer errs in making *πρωτότοκος* expressive of priority in time, and is inconsistent in applying it to the Lord before He became a man. His language that He *came to* personal existence before creation, what does it mean? Put it back as far as you like, His *becoming* a person is to me a strange proof of Meyer's own soundness in the faith; but it proves the false interpretation. The man he most opposes, Hoffmann, seems nearer the truth in this matter.

"John i. is perfectly clear that the Word was God, and *had* a personal existence as the Word with God before time began, that is, from all eternity. In time He became man; in time

He was to be (as I understand it) both first-born of all creation (*i.e.* of everything to be designated creature), and first-born from the dead, but the former as incarnate, and the latter as risen.

“Hoffmann is right in designating the genitive as expressive of relation or in an objective point of view. It is, indeed, still more common than either of its special applications to ablation or partition ; so that no objection can be valid on that score. It is notoriously comprehensive, so as to take in that which expresses comparison, value, etc., and is the objective rather than the subjective genitive. The Lord then is shown to be, not only the image of the invisible God, but first-born of all creation, meaning not priority of time, which would then be contrary to fact, but pre-eminence of dignity, no matter when He was born in time ; and this because He created all. I, too, do not deny that it is a genitive of comparison ; only it is supremacy, and not merely earliest in time, which is not true, and, if applied to His divine existence, would simply deny and destroy its reality. Did He *become* a Divine person, no matter how early in time ? It is a very narrow partition, if any, which divides this idea from Arianism. Ps. lxxxix. explains very clearly the case. For Solomon, though in fact late as being David’s tenth son, became by God’s will and sovereign choice first-born, that is, chief ; so with Christ as man, though on the infinitely deeper ground of His own divine glory and right as Creator of all.

“Hence, we must of course reject such forced efforts as that founded on the very different phrases in John i. 15 or in John xvii. 5. Origin is not the point, but relation of comparison. ‘Begotten’ or ‘born,’ in relation to the Son in the Godhead, cannot be allowed to mean a point of time, or subsequence, as I understand Meyer to mean, but simply the nearest relationship, or community of nature, between the Son and the Father. Was He or was He not Son from all eternity, as the Father was Father from all eternity ? or are we to reason from manhood, and infer

that, because a father precedes his son, so it is in the Godhead? This I believe to be Arianism, and as baseless in Scripture as in sound reasoning, if we reason from the revealed nature of Godhead.

“In words, no doubt, Meyer avoids bald Arianism; but what does he mean if not the same thing in substance? Applied to Christ as man and in time, all is plain and certainly true; and His divine glory is left untouched; whereas these speculations do sully and lower and deny it in effect. For, as I understand the opening paragraph, it is taught by Meyer that Christ is first-born of every creature, as born before all, as having *come to* personal existence, or entered on subsistent being before creation, citing Rom. i. 25, viii. 39, and Heb. iv. 13, not one of which touches the question, and saying that Prov. viii. 22 is analogous, though not equivalent. Is it the old Alexandrian idea of the *λόγος ἐνδιάθετος* becoming *προφητικός*? Is this sound doctrine? In Scripture I see the Word God, and with God eternally, not the Word coming to personal existence; I see the Son in the bosom of the Father, not entering on subsistent being, be the point ever so early so as to create all that is created.

“But, further, where is the consistency of teaching that, if *πρ. π. κτ.* means such priority as this, Christ’s *temporal* relation to the creature, it also belongs to the *entire* Christ. Certainly the entire Christ was late in the history of human kind. When the fulness of time was come, God sent forth His Son. Now, once in the end or consummation of the ages has He been manifested for putting away of sin by His sacrifice. Nay, stress is laid on the language of the apostle, that it is what Christ *is*, not what He was, that is on His exaltation as risen to heaven. How then, if it be so, are we to put this interpretation of *πρ. π. κτ.* into harmony with what we have already heard? How can this predicate, first-born of every creature, belong to the *entire* Christ, and Christ exalted after the assumption of humanity and His work on earth, in the sense of born ere yet anything created

was extant? If I do not mistake, the idea is that He who *became* personally pre-existent before the world, *became* also man, and in due time risen from the dead and exalted in heaven; but that Christ is $\pi\epsilon. \pi. \kappa\tau.$ in both senses seems to be Meyer's notion. It appears to me that the Lord is $\pi\epsilon. \pi. \kappa\tau.$ in neither sense, and that it is as incarnate He is so designated. For in becoming man His glory might have been obscured and forgotten. Taking part in blood and flesh, as the apostle says elsewhere, He might have been viewed in a way derogatory to His person and His higher nature. Therefore, He is carefully shown to be 'first-born of all creation,' and this because in the power of His person all the universe was created, invisible no less than visible; and this in strong *contradistinction* from His being 'first-born from among the dead,' which He is as exalted to heaven and head of the church. Alone, and always, and perfectly representing the invisible God, as His image, He had the headship of all creation when incarnate, the headship of the church when risen from the dead.

"And how absurd the mysticism of the Germans, who limit *ἐν* to a local sphere, as I understand, and will have it to mean that 'the creation of all things took place in Christ'! What a dreamland is all this pretension to superior accuracy, which is really but the pseudo-literalism of a schoolboy tacked on to the balloon of some wild philosophy! Had it been $\pi\rho\tilde{\omega}\tau\omicron\varsigma$ or $\pi\rho\delta \pi. \kappa.$, there might have been some grammatical reason, though poor and feeble doctrinally; whereas it is a great truth that, born when He might be, the Creator, if He deigned so to be, was necessarily, when He $\epsilon\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\tau\omicron \sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi$, $\pi\rho\omega\tau\acute{o}\tau\omicron\kappa\omicron\varsigma \pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\eta\varsigma \kappa\rho\acute{\iota}\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma$. Of course *ἐν* here means 'in virtue' or 'in the power of,' as distinguished from $\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha$, 'through' or by 'means of,' as an instrument. For the universe to be created *in* Him seems to me sheer nonsense.

"In the others I see little or nothing but what is wrong. If saints are not often scholars, scholars prove themselves almost

always poor saints. If they do not speak ill of Christ, they do not hold fast or confess aright His glory, through their desire to please men."

THE PHILANTHROPY OF GOD.

WE have received a letter from a friend on the Continent telling us of the intemperate denunciation of all ranks and classes in the country whence it comes by a temperance lecturer from another land, who had written to the newspapers in his own country that the land "was a land of drunkards ; our Bible a drunkard's Bible in order to serve the liquor traffic, our clergymen drunkards, and our archbishop a swearing drunkard." "This unhappy and bad letter has now been translated and republished in the most of our newspapers and periodicals, and the result is that very many people have become enemies to the temperance works and movements in our land."

Our correspondent then relates the special denunciation with which he had been favoured by this man, though he is, as we know, the most prominent promoter of the cause of temperance in his native land, because he did not come up to the mark of the lecturer. He is an earnest and a reforming philanthropist, and also a Christian worker, who, while (as he thinks) promoting the best interests of his country in Parliament, is also giving temperance lectures and preaching the gospel in cathedrals, churches, and other places. In our reply to him we try to show that though the joining in philanthropic works may do good for this world and time, the right thing for Christians is to confine themselves to work for the Lord in making known the gospel, and seek thus to be in the mind and current of the Holy Ghost by urging God's philanthropy on sinners ; not to join ourselves to them to be worked up into the philanthropic schemes of men for the mere improvement of man in this world. Believing that the principles it contains are divine,

scriptural, and of universal application, we now publish that portion of our letter which is of public interest to believers.

With better times and the increase of wages there has been much more drinking for some time amongst the working classes than in former years. The result of young people receiving wages that make them independent of their parents, for support, is that the family institution, the source of national strength, has become a wreck, and young men and women, in too many instances, have become lawless. Hence there are habits indulged in by them which strike us as in sad contrast with those of former years. The working men are seen crowding our public-houses after the hours of labour, and tens of thousands of young men and women are to be found promenading our streets on the evenings of the Lord's day. A few years ago this was not the practice in the city where we write. Along with this we might mention the building of three or four new theatres, at a cost of more than £100,000, as a proof that the people are becoming "lovers of pleasure rather than lovers of God." All this too on the back of "an awakening"! It is no wonder that Christian men should feel intensely about these significant signs of social deterioration, and catch at any scheme likely to lessen or remove these clamant and increasing evils.

There is a growing feeling at the present hour among social reformers and politicians that some repressive measure must be employed in order to keep down the rising tide of intemperance that is threatening the moral destruction of our people. Hence there is likely to be a great movement set on foot at once to carry out such instalments of social reformation, in opposition to the drink traffic, as may be most easily obtained. Then there will be great pressure put on Christians everywhere to join in this great philanthropic movement for social amelioration, and it will be hard for them to keep out of it if they are not aware of their heavenly calling, the heavenly character of Christianity, the separateness of the Christian's path of life and service from

that of the men of the world, and that as promoters of "the philanthropy of God" they cannot join themselves with the ungodly and become the promoters of the philanthropy of men. We hope that our letter may be of some use in helping brethren in Christ who may not have thought much on the subject, and give them scriptural reasons why they should keep themselves aloof from all human confederacies, and work from God's centre alone, and with the gospel of God, as being the exclusive "philanthropy of God" for the blessing of men, and this has induced us to publish it. There are two kinds of Christians: the spiritual and the carnal, as 1 Cor. ii. iii. indicate. The carnal will flout what we write as transcendental and chimerical; the spiritual will accept it as scriptural, and act upon it; but we will be happy to endure the contempt of the former if we ensure the profiting of the latter. "I speak as unto wise men; judge ye what I say."

But first let us read the only passage of Scripture where the word PHILANTHROPY occurs in connection with God. "But after that the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man (PHILANTHROPY) appeared, not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which He shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour; that being justified by His grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life. This is a faithful saying, and these things I will that thou affirm constantly, that they which have believed in God might be careful to maintain good works. These things are good and profitable unto men" (Titus iii. 4-8).

"I see you have had a sad time from the visit of the foreign temperance lecturer you refer to. He was here the very day your letter came, and lectured in one of the churches the next day. I was not out of the house, and did not see him, for I was not well; but I did not see any report of his address in the newspapers.

“There is no doubt great need to try to repress drinking in your country as well as in ours, and Christians ought only to allow the Scriptural use of it (1 Tim. v. 23).

“I was once very fully in the advocacy of the abolition of the liquor traffic ; but while I have the same opinion of its banefulness, I have been giving myself to the work of the gospel alone for the last seventeen years : for I now think it is properly and particularly a Christian’s work. A man of property and position, or an extensive employer of labour, feels on being converted that he could, by means of the influence he possesses, secure for his less favoured citizens many social benefits. He becomes a member of the local municipality ; and he labours for the social and moral good of the community, while he may look beyond to a higher sphere of usefulness as a member of his country’s Parliament. If Christianity were intended for the improvement of man in the flesh, instead of being the standing proof of his moral incorrigibleness and condemnation, then there would be sense enough in his pursuing such a course. He has a first-class education ; his social position is superior ; his influence is great ; he has time, ability, and money ; why not devote himself to the moral, social, and political amelioration of his less fortunate fellow-men ? The soaking of society in drink he sees to be the bane of his country ; why should he not give his help to the removing or restriction of this most baneful traffic ? There seems to be nothing more natural than for one who is uninstructed in the nature and objects of Christianity to reason thus and act accordingly. But when one knows Christianity, he sees that it points out ‘ a more excellent way.’ I should like to call your special attention to this, if you would allow me.

“Meantime I will send you by post the only copy I have of a book of mine, called the ‘ *Antichrist of England*,’ meaning by that the liquor traffic, that you may see how I used to labour in this cause twenty years ago. I have no doubt you will find in it congenial sentiments to your own ; from page 66 to the

end I depict the mischief done to the professing church by the liquor traffic. I was comparatively young then, and there are hot-headed expressions and opinions in it which I would now modify or omit—in fact I would let it alone entirely); but I do not abandon my conviction that it is one of the greatest barriers to the success of the evangelisation of the people; and even morality: only I would not now seek its subversion either by political or philanthropic means, but leave that to moral men, while I would give myself to the Word of God and prayer, as said the apostles of our Lord (Acts vi.) And I would advise you to ‘do likewise.’ I hear my Lord now saying to me—‘Let the dead bury their dead’ (it may be the most pious thing and right and natural to bury one’s father), but ‘*go thou and preach the kingdom of God*’ (Luke ix. 60).

“ Besides, I could not any longer feel it right to be joined with all sorts of people in the total abstinence or temperance society, Infidels, Atheists, Deists, Jews, Mormons, and Mahomedans! for my Lord says—‘He that is not with me is against me:’ also, ‘*Be not unequally yoked together with unbelievers*’ (see 2 Cor. vi. 14-18). This is a most important portion of Scripture, and tells Christians that they are not to be ‘*diversely yoked with unbelievers*,’ because they are ‘the temple of God,’ and holy, dwelt in and walked among by God; and nothing but separation from unbelievers will ensure being acknowledged openly as ‘sons and daughters by the Lord Almighty;’ ‘*Wherefore come out from the midst of them, and be separated, saith the Lord*, and touch not what is unclean, and I will receive you; and I will be to you a Father, and ye shall be to me for sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty.’ This makes it plain that we cannot as Christians be joined with *unbelievers* in societies, whether philanthropic and social, or religious and political. Christianity allows us to do good to all men as we have opportunity in our individual capacity; but not to join others in it who are unbelievers, so as to compromise what we

owe to Christ Himself. Christianity, practically, is the reproduction of Christ in His members ; and, consequently, we dare do nothing on earth which our blessed Lord would not have done ; and He worked all His works ‘by the finger of God,’ and not by philanthropic societies or political action, but by the power of the indwelling Holy Spirit ; and thus only are His saints to serve God. ‘I have strength for all things, through Him who giveth me power,’ said St. Paul (Phil. iv. 13). ‘Be strong in the Lord and in the power of His might’ (Eph. vi.)

“I have thought it right to give you this explanation while I send you a reading of my book, written at the level of the current Christianity of 1857, but below that of the *spiritual* Christianity of the New Testament, which actuated the holy apostles of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and has now been widely recovered. But I admit that it was written with a true-hearted desire to promote both the glory of God and the welfare of man. And though I would now seek to accomplish these ends with the same devout earnestness, I would not employ quite the same methods and means of reaching them. I frankly acknowledge your true-heartedness to Christ in your labours for the sobriety of your country, though I wish to show you that it is not the proper work for a Christian to occupy his mind and time with. I would like to keep the book as a milestone with ‘1857’ on it marking progress, as I have not another copy ; so please keep it for me till I see you again in Stockholm—if it please God that we should meet there.

“My object in forwarding the book is to let you see that I have once been as enthusiastic as yourself against the liquor traffic ; but I am now convinced that the Lord Jesus Christ demands of me occupation with and for His name alone.

“As to the other book, I have a conviction that it might be blessed to your people, linking as it does the souls of believers with Christ in the heavens, through the Holy Ghost, and engaging the renewed affections with Himself. I have just received

two letters from your country, speaking of much blessing received through the perusal of it.

“It is of all-importance that the heavenly character, as well as the church character, of the Christian calling should be known by believers, in order that they may be kept from wasting their precious time in working works for which they were not created in Christ Jesus, and which God had not before prepared that they should walk in them (Eph. ii. 10). Christianity, as a divine system, is a living connection with a risen and glorified Christ in the heavens by the Holy Ghost come down ; and practical and experimental Christianity is a realisation of the blessedness of being justified from all things from which we could not be justified by the law of Moses, and the knowledge of Christ, and of our place in Christ before God the Father, and our place of witness for Christ before men in this world, the place of Christ’s rejection. Those who have a knowledge of it are like St. Paul in Phil. iii. ; for Christianity is grateful love to Christ, and supreme attachment to Him and constant occupation with Him, for His own excellency, for what He is Himself, and not only for what He has suffered for us and given us.

“It takes much divine forming to fit saints who are naturally benevolent and philanthropic for being true Christians, for Christianity is on its negative side the renunciation of all the principles which would naturally actuate us, were we only men, and expected to ‘walk as men.’ Men were made for this earth: our bodies were formed from it, and this earth was fitted up in its present cosmical condition for man ; and there is nothing more natural than for Christians, after knowing the benefits of Christianity themselves, to feel for the miseries of their fellow-men and set to work to use Christianity for the improvement of the world. But this were an entire mistaking of the nature and aim of Christianity ; for it would suppose our being in the millennium, when Christ shall be reigning, not rejected as He is now, and when all nations shall be blessed in Him, evil shall be

subdued and righteousness become triumphant, instead of being, as we are, in a world of which Satan is said to be 'the prince' and 'the god'—a world morally ended at the Cross, and now under the doom of heaven, and going on to be dashed in pieces on the rock of eternal judgment and perdition of ungodly men, as the Apocalypse of Jesus Christ clearly reveals. God is not to improve this present world, but to save believers out of it and then to judge it; and He gives Christians intelligence of His doings in the present and of His purposes for the future, in order to keep them in their proper place—the place of men 'risen with Christ;' also to keep them at their proper work and from embarking in social and philanthropic works for the amelioration of the world, which He has not set them to do. God has raised up from the dead His Son Jesus, whom men had cast out and killed; set Him at His right hand in the heavens; and sent down the Holy Ghost to unite believers to Him there outside the world. And such are the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus—members of His body and 'members one of another;' a risen company, a new creation, a people whose citizenship is in heaven, whose Father, Lord, and home are there, and they momentarily expecting the return of their glorified Master, to take them thither in glorified bodies like His own; a people who by natural birth were men of earth, but by new and spiritual birth have become children of God, and are henceforth linked livingly by the Holy Spirit with the risen Man of glory in the heavens. I grant you the Christian's position is entirely abnormal, for he who was by nature formed for earth is by grace cut out of it, and formed by the Holy Ghost for the fellowship of the Father and the Son in the heavens.

"The heart must be formed by means *of* Christ *for* Christ in heaven; and the kind of divine truth that helps Christians to the true knowledge of Christ is truth of the greatest sanctifying power. The heavenly side of divine truth, or separation by the Holy Ghost in a new creation to Christ in the heavens,

is little known either in Stockholm or in Edinburgh ; hence saints of God are found in all sorts of doubtful circumstances and associations. They do not see that they have died out of Adam and are united to Christ, risen and glorified, by the Holy Ghost come down from Him for that purpose : and hence they think they are formed anew merely to be better citizens of this world and to improve the world : and thus their being ‘created in Christ Jesus,’ and ‘having their citizenship in heaven’ (Philip. iii. 20), are ignored or forgotten ; and hence the heavenly life of Christ is not lived by them, but only the better life of a man of the earth ! But we are ‘in Christ’ risen, not in Adam fallen and dead in sin : ‘*and if any one be in Christ, there is a new creation.*’ Christ is ‘the Beginning’ and ‘Head’ of it (Col. i. 18), as well as of ‘His body the assembly,’ ‘that He might have the first place in all things.’ Being saved people, we have ceased our existence as men ‘in the flesh,’ connected with Adam, fallen and dead in trespasses and sins, and have got a new life in Christ, ‘the last Adam,’ the ‘Second Man’ (1 Cor. xv.), and our sphere of existence is ‘*in the Spirit*,’ for ‘ye are *not in the flesh*, but *in the Spirit*,’ if so be Spirit of God dwell in you (Rom. viii. 9). Our life and walk through the world must therefore be in keeping with our birth, rank, standing, relationship, and world ; and the ends of the New Testament epistles go very minutely into divine rules and regulations for this ‘walk in newness of life’ (Rom. vi. 4). ‘*They are not of the world*, even as I am not of the world,’ as our Lord said (John xvii. 14). What a responsible thing for believers in Christ to be left here ‘in one body’ *to live Christ* ; for ‘*I no longer live*, but Christ liveth in me,’ as St. Paul said (Gal. ii. 20). I have gone out of my sin-state by the Cross of Christ and death with Him there, and come into a new life in resurrection in and with Christ : ‘I am crucified with Christ ;’ that was an end of me as a son of Adam (Gal. ii. 20) : ‘And no longer live I’ (said the apostle, say I and all believers), ‘but God who is rich in mercy . . . hath quickened us together

with Christ (by grace are ye saved), and hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in the heavenlies in Christ' (Eph. ii. 4-6). That is the beginning of my existence as a child of God ; for, once dead in sins, I get life in living association with Christ, 'who is our life,' and my future in this 'new creation' in this world and in heaven is linked with His.

"Thus 'for me to live is Christ'—not philanthropy, social reformation, or even the salvation of souls : no ! but 'for me to live is Christ.' As the ancient tale goes of a noble Roman, that if after death his heart were examined they would find 'Rome' enstamped on it ; so might St. Paul have said of Christ—'For me to live is *Christ*, and to die is gain ;' for then he would be 'with *Christ*,' which he said 'is very much better.' He was a man of one governing idea, and this he thus expresses : '*Christ* shall be magnified in my body, whether by life or by death' (Philip. i. 20).

"The body is the sphere of Christ's power, and it is with the body that we give expression to practical Christianity ; for it is the Spirit's vessel and agent : 'wherefore glorify God *in your body*,' says St. Paul (1 Cor. vi.) Where our bodies are, there is our fellowship. 'Do ye not know that your *bodies* are members of Christ ?' Again, 'Do ye not know that your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit, which is in you, which ye have of God ; and ye are not your own ? for ye have been bought with a price : glorify now then God in your body.' [There the verse ends in the Greek : it is all about *the body*.] It is very solemn to be told our bodies are '*members of Christ*' and '*temples of the Holy Ghost*' who is in us.

"This makes Christianity at once eminently spiritual and practical. We have the Holy Spirit in us as our power to reproduce Christ, and our bodies his redeemed or price-bought members to enable us to give expression outwardly to the life of Christ on earth. By the Holy Spirit the life of Christ in heaven is communicated' and energised, and through the members of

our bodies we may express practically this new and divine life. For 'old things have passed away, and all things have become new' (2 Cor. v. 17), 'and all things' in the new creation 'are of God'—not anything of 'the old man' renovated or renewed and sublimated, but positively *new*. 'That which is born of the Spirit *is spirit*.' 'For in Christ Jesus neither is circumcision anything nor uncircumcision; but *new creation*' (Gal. vi. 16). Not a particle of the old creation goes into the new. It is not old Adam rehabilitated; '*but new creation*;' 'knowing this, that our old man was crucified with Him, that the body of sin might be annulled, that we should no longer serve sin' (Rom. vi. 6). 'Now if we have *died with Christ*' (verse 7), (the end of man in this world is by death, so that, by faith, we see an end of ourselves in the death of Christ;) 'we have died with Christ' out of the sin-sphere where we were under sin's dominion, who like a tyrant lorded it over us. Not only has Christ died for my sins—the bad things that have come out of me—but I have 'died with Christ to *sin*,' the nature that produces bad things, and 'sin is condemned,' judged, and annulled in the cross, the sinner's self, 'the old man,' gets his doom also in Christ's death (Rom. viii. 3); 'So also reckon yourselves *dead to sin*; but *alive to God* in Christ Jesus' (Rom. vi. 11). 'Christ liveth unto God;' and we, being 'alive unto God in Christ Jesus,' can now also live unto God: 'Yield yourselves unto God as alive from among the dead, and your members instruments of righteousness unto God. For sin shall not have dominion over you; for ye are not under law, but under grace' (Rom. vi. 13, 14.) 'Ye also have been made dead to the law by the body of Christ, that ye might be to another, who has been raised up from among the dead in order that ye might bear *fruit to God*;' so that 'we should *serve in newness of spirit*, and not in the oldness of the letter' (Rom. vii. 4-6). 'Dead to sin and alive unto God, we walk in newness of life, and sin shall not have dominion over us;' 'dead to the law by the

body of Christ,' we 'bring forth fruit to God' and 'serve in newness of spirit.'

"Our life then is life in Christ risen—life to God; and we are to let it go up as an offering and a sacrifice, well pleasing to God for a sweet-smelling savour, as Christ's offering of Himself unto God was (Eph. v. 2). 'As is the Heavenly One, such also are the heavenly ones' (1 Cor. xv. 48). With what power the Spirit's exhortation comes to us—'If therefore ye be *risen with Christ*, seek the things which are above, where the Christ is sitting at the right hand of God. Have your mind on the things above, not on the things that are on the earth; for *ye have died*, and your life is hid with the Christ in God. When the Christ appears, who is our life, then shall ye also appear with him in glory' (Col. iii. 1-4.) 'Having put off the old man with his deeds (in the death of Christ) and having put on the new' (in Him risen from the dead) the exhortations of the Spirit to express this 'new man' through means of the body are very minute and practical (Col. iii.); 'but Christ is everything, and in all' (Col. iv. 11). He is before all as an object; 'in all' as a life. Hence all are responsible for living the heavenly risen life of Jesus in their bodies in all the relationships of time and in all the intercourse of their daily life.

"I have written a very long letter; but seeing that I mentioned to you that I had seen into the meaning of Christianity so as no longer to be able to go on with *the mere improvement of man*, as he is in the old creation, I felt it necessary to justify my new position by the word of God: and that has led me to show where we are now, as believers in Christ, and that we are expected to fall in with 'the philanthropy of our Saviour-God,' as those who are 'alive unto God' in Christ—'risen with Christ'—'*created in Christ Jesus unto good works*, which God has before prepared that we should walk in them' (Eph. ii. 10). The cross of Christ tells its sad tale that 'the world' is

enmity against God, and unimprovable. It was 'the judgment of this world'—'the end of the world,' morally when it rejected and crucified Christ, for it thereby proved itself incorrigible ; for not only did it refuse to be reconciled by God in Christ in person bestowing all manner of blessings, but it murdered the Reconciler. Wherefore God is not any longer trying to improve it : but He is calling out men from it by the gospel of His grace, and associating them in a living and divine way with His Son in the heavens ; for the whole question is now about the worth and glory of His exalted Son whom the world has cast out. The Spirit has come for this object : '*He shall glorify me*, for He shall take of mine, and show it unto you' (John xvi.) 'Ye shall be witnesses *unto me*.' He is sitting on the Father's throne now (Rev. iii. 21), and He will come in manifested glory soon, and sit upon the throne of His glory (Matt. xxv.), and He will subdue all things to Himself, and reign to the glory of God the Father. (1 Cor. xv.)

"This present evil world will end in a time of judgment among the nations, and terrible tribulation, such as has not been from the foundation of the world. God's word tells us that the sun of this dispensation will set in blood when the book of Revelation will have its great and awful fulfilment. It is blessed to think that God's word tells of a happy and holy time beyond the flood of fire and judgment of ungodly men, when earth shall celebrate its Sabbath of holy rest for a thousand years (Rev. xx.) Then the world will be divinely changed : and righteousness shall reign over all its nations, who shall walk by the light of the heavenly city, whose light is the Lamb. The sentence of this world is passed : its doom and punishment are certain, and cannot be far off. God, by the Holy Ghost, is gathering a body and a bride for Christ His Son out of it, and giving such His life, place, relationship, and work, walk, and prospects : and He is not touching the world at all so as to make it better, but He is doing this one work of calling out and preparing a bride

for the glory of his Son, our heavenly Bridegroom ; and this is the work that should engross all the children of God, whom He has called out of the world in its every shape and form to stand outside of it in the place it gave His well-beloved Son when they rejected and crucified Him. We have God's mind expressly given in His Word respecting this, that we may not throw away our time, means, and energies, on objects of our own : for it teaches that while human philanthropy relieves man where he is, and leaves him there, GOD'S PHILANTHROPY completely saves him, and brings him to Himself in glory to have 'Christ as gain' in the Father's house, where His glory is fully seen, and His saints are conformed to His image.

"What then makes a practical *Christian* ? That a man should be completely absorbed, and continually occupied with Christ, so that he seems to the world to be as one 'beside himself' for Christ ; like as Paul seemed to Festus, when he tells of Christ appearing to him ; and 'Festus says, with a loud voice, *Thou art mad, Paul.*' (Acts xxvi.) 'But he said, I am *not mad*, most excellent Festus, but utter words of truth and soberness.' Again, in Philip. iii. he seems to be 'beside himself ;' for, having given up all for Christ on earth, he presses on towards the goal to win Christ and have Him in the glory of God in the heavens. 'For whether we be *beside ourselves*, it is to God ; or are sober, it is for you. *For the love of Christ constraineth us ;* having judged this, that if one died for all, then all died ; and he died for all, that they who live should no longer live to themselves, but to Him who died for them and rose again' (2 Cor. v. 13, 14).

"If we have the excellency of the knowledge of Christ—if He Himself be our exclusive object, as He was St. Paul's—we will live such a life of practical separation from the world and devotedness to Christ, and of occupation with his objects, as to make the world say, These men are either *mad*, or, they are in possession of a divine secret of which we know nothing."

WESTMINSTER CONFESSION OF FAITH.

April 10, 1877.

I MIGHT as well have replied to your last letter at once, and said that I had no desire to wade through the "Westminster Confession of Faith," or whatever else it may be called, with any purpose of writing about the book itself, in detail.

Personally there was nothing in it which could have profited me, either for "communion in the truth" with Christ, or in service for Him, as gathering souls to Him where He *now* is!

Controversially, it presented a temptation, but this I refused; so that the whole matter has been authoritatively ordered (as they say elsewhere) "to lie on the table."

It caught my eye this morning, and upon looking it through again, I am more confirmed in the futility, and one might add the *fatal*ity, of creeds from Scripture; and of confessions of faith from creeds; as well as of catechisms (large or small) from confessions; were it only for the simple but obvious reason that God in His wisdom and grace has given us exactly the revelation of Himself and of His Son that most suits His own glory and our blessing, both now and hereafter; and this is contained in what we rightly call "the word of God."

There is, however, another reason, and of great importance, as regards "*this* book," which comprises "the Westminster Confession of Faith"—that, even supposing it drawn from the whole word of God by "the assembly of divines," however learned and godly they may have been, yet it could only *in result* be the minimum of what would satisfy them to agree upon (that is, if they were expected to be unanimous); and this came out at last, as the fruit of their labours, in "a creed published and proclaimed by authority." The word of God was in this way set aside, and conscience as well as faith interfered with, in their

distinct and direct exercise before God, upon the revelation He has made of Himself to us *as a whole*.

A very serious question arises out of this, viz. that if the truth of God's own word is reduced to the minimum of what will satisfy an "assembly of divines and others," what becomes of the maximum upon which they could *not* agree together? Evidently this maximum is in the word of God itself, and the minimum, both in quality and quantity, is only what suited the spiritual perceptions or the moral mind of the assembly. Nor is this "assembly of divines" fair to itself and its own reputation, for the few (upon this graduated scale of theological investigation) who would rise higher than the many, must necessarily compromise their own convictions, and yield their judgment to *the lowest*, if unanimity is demanded. Or, if a majority is allowed to be decisive, still the question remains, decisive of *what*? It is a very solemn alternative, in all such assemblies thus convened, that the maximum (which is God's) is the precious thing sacrificed; or, if not yielded up, *who* gets it? Certainly *none* of the churches represented by this convocation in England, Scotland, or Ireland, for they accept the Confession of Faith, and "the minimum" of what the divines could agree upon. My question is again repeated on behalf of the truth and of God and His word—Where is "the maximum" gone? and *who* is he that has craftily got it away from the members of Convocation, and cunningly substituted "the shields of brass" for the golden shields of Parvaim which adorned the temple in the days of Solomon, when "the glory of God" dwelt therein?

It will be melancholy to pursue this subject farther, and to speak to you of "the covenants—the national and solemn league—the engagement of duties—directories for *public* worship—form of church government—with the Acts of Assembly and Parliament relative to and approbative of the same," which *all* lead men back into the wrong world, upon the fatal principle of reducing a thing by its lowest term to its lowest quantity!

In continuance, let me ask you, or any Christian who knows the maximum, and maintains it by separation from these convocations (with all else *who by grace will*), What are the terms "agreed upon by this assembly of divines at Westminster, with the assistance of commissioners from the Church of Scotland"? One of their title-pages expresses these terms, "as a part of the covenanted uniformity in religion betwixt the churches of Christ, in the kingdoms of Scotland, England, and Ireland;" and, moreover, "ratified and established by Acts of Parliament," etc.

Upon this showing, and according to this rule, these churches cannot be "the body of Christ;" it is *openly* a worldly system, and for man as a citizen of the earth. God's maximum is lost. That is to say, a believer in Christ, in union with "the Last Adam" in life and righteousness, as Head of the new creation of God, is dropped out; so also is the Lord in heaven, as "Head over all things to the church, which is His body, the fulness of Him which filleth all in all;" as likewise the abiding presence of the Holy Ghost, come down from the glorified Christ at Pentecost, to dwell in and baptize the members into this unity upon earth. Endeavouring to keep "the unity of the Spirit" in the bond of peace is not even *in* their minimum, to say nothing of "the bride," and "the marriage of the Lamb." As for the blessed hope of the Lord's coming, and "the taking-up of the saints to meet Him in the air," it is outside this vaunted Confession of Faith and its catechisms, as well as "*the sum* of saving knowledge," etc.

In vain do you look for the coming of "the Son of man in glory," when He shall take to Himself His great power and reign over this world, and order it in righteousness and universal blessing for every creature; till finally "He will deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father, that God may be all in all." Indeed, most of what concerns the purposes and counsels of "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ,"

both as to the heavens and the earth, whether now or hereafter, are left behind in the maximum of divine revelation.

We may well say to each other, How could *such* disclosures come out, under "an ordinance of the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament, for the calling of an assembly of learned and godly divines *and others* for the settling" of the government and liturgy of these national churches of England and Scotland; as also "to establish, ratify, and confirm the Presbyterian Church government and discipline by kirk sessions, presbyteries, provincial synods, and general assemblies"?

The order of God for the earth in the millennium, by the restoration and conversion of Israel under the rule and reign of the Lord the Messiah, as well as the future blessing of the Gentiles through them, when gathered to "Jerusalem, the city of the great King," and the deliverance of creation from its groaning into "the glorious liberty of the sons of God," might also be adduced in proof that what most concerns the manifested glory of God and of Christ, in the midst of His earthly people on this earth (and the binding of Satan, and casting him into the bottomless pit), have no place in this compendium "done at Westminster and in Edinburgh."

It is lamentable to see that in this conclave "of divines and commissioners assembled in the chapel called King Henry the VII.'s Chapel, aided by committees deputed by both the Houses of Parliament," the new order of manhood set up in the risen and glorified "Second Man," at the right hand of God in heaven, as the beginning and Head of a new race of men, "whose bodies are the temples of the Holy Ghost" on earth, has been entirely overlooked. The new order of God in a heavenly sphere and by a new system, of which the ascended Son of man is become *now* the centre and Lord, passes into the same oblivion, as a matter of course, or rather as a necessary consequence of the former. All that is set apart and called out by God in grace to form and distinguish this new order of creation, in heaven above

and the earth beneath, *presently* with Christ in manifested glory and blessing, is in eclipse. The necessities which required our being "born again" *as men*, to see what the natural eye had not seen, or to understand what the heart had never conceived, in this new order of things "which God has prepared for them that love Him" for present enjoyment and communion with Christ, are, alas! overlooked, because the objects themselves are out of mind, and catechetical examinations substituted.

How could it be otherwise? They follow as naturally as cause and effect; nor is this all the mischief, for "the anointing and unction of the Holy Ghost," whereby *a saint* is competent "to understand the things that are freely given to us of God," slips away with the new birth. Earth takes the place of heaven, and the first man becomes the object of interest, instead of the Second Man "in the glory of God" on high. As a consequence, Christ is reduced to these sacraments and ordinances, or else connected with forms of worship and ceremonial observances authorised by divines, and established by houses of Parliament, for the populations of England and Scotland and Ireland, and for "man in the flesh" coming from anywhere else.

Thus "the fine gold is become" not merely "dim," but turned into dross and corrupted, and Christianity proper is dragged down to the very level of Judaism, as regards God and man, upon the footing of the Decalogue; as though this standing remained an unsolved problem, and Christ had not accomplished redemption from under its curse, and its very *principle*, hundreds of years ago. I need scarcely remind you that a Christian's charter runs thus: "Sin shall not have dominion over you, for ye are *not under law* but under grace."

In fact, these churches recognise man as under the law and covenant; and yet put his offspring into sacramental grace by baptism. It is true the minister only declares this rite "to be the admission of the party baptized" into outward privileges, against which I have nothing to say. But he then affirms

“it to be a sign¹ and seal of the covenant of grace; of his ingrafting into Christ; of regeneration; of remission of sins,” etc. He thus openly takes the blessings, which belong only to a Christian *by faith* in Jesus Christ, as born of the Spirit; and confers them upon one who is as yet merely in the flesh. Surely *this* is not in our “confession of faith,” but a sorry departure from the “grace and truth” of the gospel. Thus, all that God has done to redeem man by blood, and lift him up to His own glory with “the Son of His love,” who is already there as the forerunner, has been so obscured by this combination of human wisdom and legislative authority as to lie “a maximum” wrapt up in the word of God, for those who make *it* their confession of faith and hope.

Practically I repeat that this “covenanted uniformity” finds its starting point and gets its motive power from the little babe, an infant of days, born of the flesh; with its parents, and godfathers and godmothers, its sponsors, etc., on the one side; and on the other, there stands the Ecclesiastic to declare “the remission of sins, and an ingrafting into Christ,” by the assumed efficacy of sacerdotal and sacramental grace, as administered to a sucking child! Only stop the nurse and the infant at the church door, and the minister’s hands are empty; yea, all this imposing machinery would be at a stand-still.² If there were no infants brought to be baptized, there would be no proper boys and girls for “the Shorter Catechism,” nor recognised adults for “the Larger.” In vain would they look for men and women, religiously educated, to bring under the obligations and covenants suited to riper years “and greater capacity.”

But enough. I have merely sought to show that what was “approved by the General Assembly, and ratified and established by Acts of Parliament, as the publick and avowed confession of the Church of Scotland, with the proofs from the Scripture” (see

¹ See “The Confession of Faith,” chapter xxviii.

² Our correspondent is not what is called a Baptist, though writing thus.

the title-page to the Confession of Faith), does not recognise a believer as "a citizen of heaven" *now*, and one with the Son of man in glory—"not of this world, even as Christ was *not* of the world." On the contrary, this book and its contents, from cover to cover, recognises "man *in the flesh*," from his very infancy, and makes provision for his advancement by the means and appliances we have examined : and by giving him "the law as a rule of life" (*which* life?) he is encouraged and stimulated by vows, covenants, and solemn leagues, to prove the strength of this life *in the flesh*, and what the man is worth who goes through it to despair, and the cry "O wretched man that I am!"

It is the opposite of the Christian who begins as a dead man in this world—alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord—and one with the risen Lord in heaven the Second Man ; having his citizenship and his affections where Christ sits.

There are two classes or companies *now*, as there were when Paul wrote to the Colossians. To the one he said, "Ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God. . . . Mortify therefore your members which are upon the earth," etc. ; and this is surely Christian position and unearthly practice still. To the other Paul says, "If ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of this world, why, as though *living* in the world, are ye subject to ordinances (touch not, taste not, handle not, which all are to perish with the using) after the commandments and doctrines of men ?" and *this* is as surely "ritualism."

The heavenly system of God's new order, with the Second Adam at its head on high, and the old earthly system, "with its worldly sanctuary" and man in the flesh *alive* upon the earth, mistaking death and life too, as known in Christ, and therefore subject to *ordinances*, are the two subjects brought before us by all these considerations. May the Lord open the eyes and ears of His beloved ones, that they may take their places with the departed Lord and find their present position where He has found His, in the Father's love ; and *live out* "the life of Christ" on earth, the little while we wait for Him !

The Holy Ghost came down from heaven at Pentecost to bear witness to the glorified Son of man on high ; and to gather out and quicken the members of Christ into life and union with the Last Adam, the head and beginning of God's new order of manhood, and of another creation in the heavens.

"Outside the camp to Jesus, bearing His reproach," is our present opportunity, and the refusal of this "covenanted uniformity in religion" affords a fine occasion to any exercised conscience for getting out of forms, into the truth of the Church.

Any one who, by faith and communion with Christ through the truth, sees what the nature and calling by the Holy Ghost of the "church of the living God" really is, upon this earth, *has got the light* by which to contrast this "covenanted uniformity in religion" with our real unity in Christ by divine revelation from the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and to put himself right.

What a mercy when one discovers this difference, and gets out of the old order of God for the earth into His new order in Christ for the heavens ! One step, and a bold one, clears the distance by simple obedience to His revealed mind and will.

Uniformity in religion for Scotland or England must needs be accompanied by a Public Confession of belief ; sustained by its appointed ordinances, and an ordained clergy in ministry, on behalf of the people.

Moreover, such a religion requires to have its "worldly sanctuary, as by law established," for the performance of all its offices and functions ; and goes upon the arithmetical principle of church-extension, to meet the requirements of an increasing population ! But where, in *all this*, is "the faith once delivered to the saints" ? And, what is become of "the faith of God's elect, and the truth which is after godliness" ? Yea, who are "God's elect," and where may they be found ? *What* in these last days is "the faith" for which we are to contend ? are questions for grave and individual consideration before the Lord !

THE QUESTION AND THE CRISIS.

Halifax, Nova Scotia, April 19th.

MY DEAR BROTHER—I send you some details on the statements made in the papers you sent me. Mr. Smith says, Ezra ix. 11. proves that Deuteronomy vii. must be from the prophets ; but we have exactly the same statement in Exodus xxxiv. 11-17 ; so that his proof proves nothing, unless Exodus be from the prophets too. But prophet is a mere word for those who spoke the word of God, as Abraham is called a prophet, and Moses.

Besides, the argument is an absurdity. It is an absurdity to pretend that Ezra, a ready scribe in the law of Moses, who, it is alleged, compiled it in its last form, should speak as if it was not given by Moses at all, and say it was the prophets, and yet say in the same sentence, Israel was going into the land to possess it when the commandment was given, as he does. Only a rationalist, who can believe anything but the simple truth, but no one of sound sense, could swallow such a fancy as this. If Ezra referred to Deuteronomy (which is very likely, as he speaks of going in to possess the land, which characterises that book), then he assuredly refers to it as given before the Israelites entered into the land. None but those accustomed to assume, and justify too, forgery in documents which pretend to be divine, could allege that Ezra attributes to prophets of the seventh or eighth century a statement of the law which he was teaching as the law of Moses ; and, in the deep grief of his heart about their sins before God, accredit and state the forgery in speaking to God. Upon the face of it, to apply “thy servants the prophets,” saying, “the land into which ye go to possess it” to prophets hundreds of years after they possessed it, is a gross absurdity. The defilement of the land is not particularly

spoken of in Deut. vii. ; it is much more in other chapters, and more especially in Lev. xviii.

I must add a few words on the prudent, wise speech reported in your Scotch journals as that of Dr. Rainy. I can only take it as it appears, "wary and well considered." Supposing, speaking of course as a mere natural man, that some one had given my mother a box on the ear, instead of knocking him down or thrusting him away, I say, Well, but I must see if the fingers reached to the ear : otherwise this is not a box on the ear ; if it only struck the cheek, the accusation is not correct. With what feelings should one view such a son ? With profound contempt. Here I must add indignation, because the faith of thousands is in question. The speech would insist that it should not be felt there was a crisis. There is a crisis, and the crisis is this : Whether the Free Church of Scotland in its public profession be, however many may object to its tenets or forms, a body maintaining the faith of Christianity as based on the word of God, or not. It is not Professor Smith who is on trial ; it is the Free Church. I have no interest in either save as a Christian ought to be interested in all men and all good ; but in the authority of the word of God every one who is loyal to Christ must be. Members of commissions may laugh if it be asked, Are we to have a Bible or no ? but this is the question. Germans may hold, still pretending to be Christians, that the allegation of miracles at once renders a book unhistorical ; but the proofs by which they convince others that it cannot be are the proofs by which Mr. Smith would prove that the Pentateuch, and especially Deuteronomy, are unhistorical, and these are with heartless indifference, on the ground of legal technicalities, to be allowed to be valid on the plea that Mr. Smith on other grounds holds them trustworthy. And what grounds are these ? That, because these Shemitic historians, like Thucydides or Livy giving speeches they invent as spoken by the persons they wrote about, do not think it fraud to put the words in their

heroes' mouths, we must take them as they gave them, and they were received at the time ; and this is divine inspiration ! Does he mean, or does the speech mean, that this fabled Shemitic system was held at the time for divine inspiration ? That they received what was known to be put into Moses' mouth by a modern author to polish crude legislation, as the WORD OF GOD by the mouth of Moses, saying, "Jehovah spake unto Moses saying," when they knew and received it as Mr. S. does now, (namely, that it was not so given), though some few portions might be true traditions of what Moses taught ? Let us see what the "wary and well-considered" compromise speech in the journal amounts to. Mr. Smith is guarded enough. We have this account of Scripture from him : The written record of the revelation of God's will which is necessary unto salvation makes use of certain forms of literary presentation which have always been thought legitimate in ordinary composition, but which were not always understood to be used in the Bible. Used by whom ? How carefully the inspiration of the writings is avoided ! Mr. S. does not call this fraud as Dr. Kuenen honestly does ; ("pious fraud") : that is his opinion, but not the question.

In classical authors no one is troubled about it ; men did the best they could, or what they would, to present matters as they saw them, or would please their readers. Did the Holy Ghost do so ? The record uses the fraud of literary compositions which I do not call fraud ! But where is God in the matter ? How carefully He is left out ! What more can an infidel want ? What does an extreme infidel as Dr. Kuenen, or a violent-tempered but more sober-minded infidel as Ewald, or one in borrowed plumes as Mr. Newman, desire than to reduce the Scriptures to this level ? This is what the system of Mr. S. does. He now tells us that for other reasons (which he withheld in what went out to all the world, and till this was called in question) he believes in the authority of these books ; but the proofs he gives to all the world, and which are unrecalled, are

proofs, not (mind) of a date, but that the books are not what they pretend to be. Does he believe that the composers and compilers and polishers were *inspired* to say that their work was God speaking by Moses? Nothing can be clearer than that it was so given, and sanctioned by the Lord's authority as such. Their nature, their authority, their contents, depended on these contents being inspired. They had no other, they have no other; the very circumstances are identified with the truth of their being by Moses and from God, for that is inseparably interwoven with the history they contain. On this I shall speak again in touching on the reported speech. But the Scriptures, even in his defence, are not spoken of by Mr. S. when defined as inspired. When he justifies the statement by quotation of the Confession, they are a record of the revelation of God's will but formed after the pattern of literary compositions which ascribe to orators or the like speeches invented for them. This is not inspiration of the Scriptures. It may lead us to distrust "Confessions" as no better than a sieve, as a means of securing truth, and saving those who hold the opposite of what their authors held, but that is all. But I turn to the reported speech and the wary defence of Mr. S. The speech saves the credit of the speaker. 'On reading the article it was with the greatest possible feeling of apprehension and pain. Not only he did not agree, but it would not meet with general approbation; he had a very strong impression that they were fitted in the greatest degree to create bewilderment, anxiety, and misapprehension in the mind of members of the church.' What about? Was it not as to the authority and inspiration of the Scriptures? Yet such a question, we are told, cannot possibly arise, or might be soon settled. Now, I do ask what was the bewilderment and anxiety about? Mr. S. accepts and gives the proofs of infidels that the Scriptures were the development of crude legislation and national life, large portions professing to be what they were not, nor of the age nor of the person who was stated to have re-

ceived them from God as God's law—gives these proofs as general satisfactory proofs that the case was thus, without a hint that he thought otherwise. He propagates infidelity, for everybody knows it is infidelity and the elaborately wrought out theory of infidels ; which we are now to understand he does not believe, though he believes all the proofs of it. As to the Canon, one book was really a love-song about the purity of northern Israel contrasted with Solomon, which we should have lost but for a false theory about its being an allegory ; but the bewilderment and anxiety was not about the inspiration or Canon of Scripture, nor whether we are to have the whole Bible ! But Mr. S. and all agree, we are told, that the Bible is inspired. What then was his article about ? The escape from the difficulty is : The question is not about inspiration, but whether certain positions brought in, in connection with the explanation of Professor Smith's views on the Bible, are really inconsistent with this position. A queer roundabout sentence ; but have we no views of Mr. S. on the Bible, or parts of it ? Nothing but positions in connection with the explanation of his views ? And is what every one knows to be characteristic of modern infidelity in the theological sphere to be spread broadcast by professors of theology, without a hint of anything else ? Nay, accepting really as desirable progress, views that are to every honest mind totally destructive of the inspiration of Scripture, and then to be told there is no question about inspiration ? And how is it excused in a compromising way ? We are not, we are told, to deal with it as if some party were rising up to unsettle and undermine these great doctrines. But a party has arisen up, and, as every one occupied with these subjects knows, unsettling and undermining these great doctrines ; and all that Mr. Smith has done is to popularise them in a well-known book of general science, the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, wherever the English language is spoken in the two continents. He has reproduced and disseminated for all English readers, and as valid, the well-known

modern grounds of infidelity as to these great truths. Scotland and the Free Church have been the source, or, if not the source, the instrument, of spreading over the world modern infidelity as to inspiration and the canon of Scripture as a part of the more accurate knowledge of modern science in a popular publication. That is the broad fact, and no special pleading in church courts and committees in Scotland will alter it ; nor, it is to be feared, if the Free Church clear itself, undo it.

The speech defends the position of the committee as far as it dares ; it does not agree with Mr. S., but defends its " deliverances " on the substantive merits, mark, not on the competency of the committee. " You will not succeed in laying a libel for heresy in connection with this view of Deuteronomy." I should not call it heresy : infidelity is its true character. However, the published speech declares that to hold that a book purporting to be spoken by Moses immediately before Israel's entrance into the land, and directly from Jehovah as words from His mouth in reference to their conduct as so entering, was not so spoken but written some hundreds of years after, proving this by passages alleged to be in contradiction with what was ordained by Jehovah originally, is not heresy as to the inspiration of the books. Such false statement, it is alleged, was a generally allowed license of literary composition. Were these late modifiers of the old law moved by the Holy Ghost to say that Jehovah spake it all by Moses before Israel's going in to possess the land ? " It is," we are told, " a different case where there is a general disposition in certain quarters, or in any quarter, to move off from these fundamental doctrines." Is there none such ? Every one knows that large masses of Protestants, and Protestant teachers, have moved off from these fundamental doctrines both in Germany and in England ; that their works are translated into English, and have largely affected the public mind ; that this attack on the inspiration of the Scriptures is one of the chief characteristics of modern infi-

delity ; that the "Deuteronomist" is one of their chief points along with the "Great Unnamed," Zechariah, and the Song of Songs as a northern pastoral. Now, I will suppose that as yet this hacking up of Scripture has not penetrated into the Free Church, at least in "any quarter." The speech assures that an attempt to make heresy of these views will not succeed. A man is "not particularly wise who is particularly sure about them ;" that is about the usual orthodox view of the inspiration of Deuteronomy, etc. True, "a man is not particularly wise who is particularly ready to raise questions about them." The questions on many points as to authorship, date, and so on, are "awkward questions." "They are really not matters of faith at all." How calculated to relieve "bewilderment, anxiety, and misapprehension, in the minds of members of the church"! Mr. S. had done something to relieve this feeling in his answer to the sub-committee. He tells us of a "persuasion of the divine authority of the book (of Deuteronomy), which rests on the witness of our Lord, the *testimonium Spiritus Sancti*. It would be possible to adjust the result thus. But this the speech cuts away from under our feet. As to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, it "does not believe that Jesus and His apostles ever said anything on that subject." But kirk commissioners will hardly make sober men think that it is declared by inspiration that "Jehovah spake unto Moses, saying," when it was not Moses at all ; and that when the Lord says "Moses' writings," "He never said anything on that subject."

It is trifling to talk of who wrote down the words ; the question is, Is it a divinely given, and therefore perfect, account of what God spake and did by Moses, and was really uttered by Him, interwoven as it is with all the details of the history of God's people? We know that, save that to the Galatians, Paul wrote none of his epistles. In one case we know who did it for him : "I, Tertius, who wrote this epistle." He signed each, saluting in grace, that it might be authentic. Does any one think because

Tertius adds that, sanctioned as it is by the Pauline salutation, we have not Paul's inspired writings? All this is child's play, and worse. The speech does "not see how a very conclusive argument could be raised against any one maintaining that the book of Deuteronomy was written after the promised land was occupied, and therefore by some one living in the promised land, though he was directed and enabled to embody in that book the authentic declarations and speeches of Moses." This will tacitly, seemingly at least, screen the infidel system which insists on its being written afterwards in the land and not by Moses. But save in one fatal word it does not touch the question. It is perfectly immaterial when and where it was written, as in Tertius's writing the Epistle to the Romans, provided I have a divinely given and therefore divinely authentic word and reproduction of what Moses said before Israel entered into the land, as the book professes to be. We have no statement that Moses textually wrote anything but the song in xxxii. and the law put beside the ark of the covenant, but there is no "embodying" what Moses said in some other record. It professes to give what Moses said by God's command and with God's authority to the people before their entry into the land, stating where it was spoken; and all through the book it is almost chapter by chapter repeated, "the land which ye go in to possess." Now who wrote it is no more important than Tertius in Romans; but if it be not Moses who spoke the things before Israel's crossing the Jordan, and really the directions for Israel in the land when actually going in to possess it, the book is a false book, not an inspired one—an imposition of some later hand, not a revelation of God. And this is what the system in fact alleges.

It does not "embody" what Moses spoke. It gives, and states that it gives, what he spake and where. And if this be not true, the book is not true. But the statement of the speech, while screening the statement of Mr. S., does not touch it. That statement, as of all the infidel school who hold this, is that the

Deuteronomist put Moses' name in as a license of literary composition ; that it was written centuries afterwards—some Mosaic revelations and modifications and adaptations of later development thrown into the form of a declaration and testimony by Moses. A crude legislation—such is the theory—was developed and perfected by the priests and the national life of the people. Let any one read Deuteronomy and see what it professes to be, and say if such be its character ;—whether it “embodies” sayings of Moses, or whether it be not, save the last chapter which has nothing to do with the question, the directions of God by Moses to Israel before going into the land. I deny the alleged additions and contradictions. That there are provisions for a state of things which did not exist in the wilderness is quite true, a considerable part consists of civil enactments adapted to their condition in the land when the kingly government did not exist. There are two probable interpolations, like “there it is unto this day” (ii. 10-12, 20-23), and possibly one other passage besides (iii. 9), which may or may not be ; that is, one or two small parentheses evidently such, which do not affect the substance of the book, nor have anything to do with a later date.

And let it be here remarked, the question is not about dates or writers where Scripture does not state who speaks or writes, but about inspiration. People may discuss who wrote the Hebrews as no author is named ; it may be wise or unwise ; but that the Spirit of God dictated it, that it is inspired, is another question. I hold the tradition as to Luke and Mark wholly irrelevant. The question is, Are they inspired accounts of the Lord's life ? Learning from Peter is nothing to the purpose if they are not inspired ; from Paul as an eye-witness Luke could not : indeed his own statement leaves no ground for it. The question is this : When Deuteronomy says, These are the words which Moses spake, are they really such ? or something concocted, centuries after, out of a crude legislation given under Moses through the development of national life, by priests or prophets

who contended against them? Though, indeed, we are called on to believe that the law which was the priest's work, at least the Deuteronomic or more advanced form of it, was concocted by a prophet, one of the class opposed to the priests; for we are to believe anything provided it be not inspiration and the truth of God. I have nothing to do with Mr. S. or commissions of the Free Church. The question is far wider than that; it is of the propagation of an infidel view of Scripture all over the English-speaking world in a popular book of science. The Free Church is indeed on its trial as to faithfulness, but the evil has to be combated on its own merits. It may be sorrowful to see every professing body of Christians more or less giving up the truth; but the question is there, and we cannot avoid it. The word of God, the Scriptures, are what we are taught to rely on, and those who are taught of God will rely on them. The enemies' attacks are especially directed against them. Cavils and special pleading will not do in this conflict; it must be the faith of God's elect, or spiritual "traditores" on whom no reliance can be placed in the conflict.

I have had some doubt as to sending you this, because I believe, as I have said above, the question must be treated on its merits, and this is (save the first paragraph, as to Ezra) on the kirk commission, and what is reported as Dr. Rainy's speech, to me far more painful than Mr. S.'s article. It is a question of the Free Church about inspiration as well as about inspiration itself. It is only a bye-battle, and it ought to be treated for God on its own merits. But if you think it may be useful *for souls*, you may use it. But the question is raised, and will have to be discussed, not as a local but as a fundamental question. As I have told you before, it has long pressed upon me as an impending conflict.

NON EADEM IMAGO.

OPTIME, CARISSIME!—Literas tuas accepi. . . . Vides inter me et te nonnihil discriminis esse. Tibi non placuit, quod prioribus literis scripsi. Interrogas, cur Ioh. xiv. 9 in hunc locum adhibuerim ac non talem locum, qui esset de ipsa re de qua ageretur. Imo satis est respondere, illum locum ad hanc rem pertinere. Certissima sunt haec duo : 1°, qui Filium videt Patrem videt ; 2°, ex fide non ex operibus est iustificatio. Quae si certissima sunt, haec aequae certa sequuntur : (1°), falsa est omnis theologia, quae aliam facit Patris imaginem aliam Filii ; (2°), falsa est omnis theologia, quae ex operibus pendit iustificationem. Qui vero docet, Patrem postulasse, Filium solvisse, pretium quoddam Patri postulanti, is aliam facit Patris imaginem aliam Filii, imo aliam facit Patris aliam Filii iustitiam. Quod si haec, quae in Patre est iustitia pretium postulans, bona qualitas est, Filius non Deus est neque Dei similis ; invenitur enim bona qualitas, qua caret Filius ; qui vero bona quadam qualitate caret, Deus non est. Si vero haec iustitia pretium postulans etiam in Filio est, necesse est alius Filio pretium quod debeatur solvat ; quod si ita est, in Romanum cultum incidimus et ex operibus pendet iustificatio. Optime frater, multa dicta sunt et multa dicuntur et laudantur, ut haec quae maxime est simplex res obscuretur, atque scio et apud vos et apud nos theologum maxime profundus haberi et vocari, qui maxima subtilitate possit oculos et aures legentium et audientium obturare, ne videant quam immensum sit intervallum inter S. Scripturam et Anselmi theologiam, quam sequuntur. Nulla vero subtilitas efficere poterit, ne certum sit in Ioh. xiv. 9 frangi omnem theologiam, quae aliam faciat Patris aliam Filii imaginem. Neque est locus, imo ne unus quidem, ubi doceat S. Scriptura pretium quoddam Filium Patri

solvisse. Dum in villa mea versabaris, ostendi tibi permultos locos, et ex N. Test. et ex LXX. sumptos, qui liberationem, salvationem, ἀπολύτρωσιν, vocant et λύτρον illud, per quod fit salvatio (Luc. ii. 38, xxi. 28; Rom. viii. 23; 1 Cor. i. 30; Ephes. i. 14, iv. 30; Ebr. xi. 35; Psalm. cxix. 154, lxix. 19, cxi. 9, etc.) Atque prorsus eodem modo ea salvatio quae est per Iesum ἀπολύτρωσις vocatur et illud λύτρον quod nos salvavit. Si rex sanguinem et vitam profundens exercitum suum salvat et praeclaram victoriam vincit, dicitur etiam nostra et vestra (credo) lingua *magno pretio* victoriam peperisse; quod si quis interrogat, *cui* illud pretium solvens victoriam exercitui pepererit sive emerit, nemo respondebit. Atque scio, si missam feceris illam, qua imbutus es, Anselmi theologiam et S. Scripturam perscruteris, te facile illud inventurum esse. Quamdiu vero illa theologia oculos obscurat, fieri non potest ut quis S. Scripturam intelligere possit. Ubicumque enim videt veritatem gratiae descriptam tamquam subiiciet ei illam pretii-solvendi-doctrinam. Haec vera est Scripturae ratio: 1°, Deus amavit mundum; 2°, propterea quod Deus amavit mundum, Filium misit, non ut sibi solveret quod deberet mundus, sed ut mundum salvaret; 3°, ut illud opus efficere posset Filius, Pater ei omnem potentiam in coelis et in terra tradidit; 4°, Filius Patri obediens venit, mortuus est, etc.; 5°, iam in dextra Patris sedens regnat, donec substrati sint hostes; 6°, postrema quum ei situs erit extremus hostis (*i.e.* mors), regnum Patri reddet et ipse se Patri subiiciet (1 Cor. xv).

DE PROPITIATIONE.

FRATER CARISSIME!—Filius certe Patrem ostendit, quod dicit Ioh. xiv. 9 ; atque hoc, ut verissimum, ita gravissimum, quicumque Deo credit libentur accipiet ; quicumque autem spreverit, illius gloriam, qui huc devenit ut efficeret propitiationem, sine dubio negabit, imo ipsam propitiationem subvertet. Personae enim dignitas divinam ad opus faciendum facultatem dedit, perfecto autem operi efficaciam infinitam.

Verum ad propitiationem efficiendam opus est longe pluribus quam jure Domini divino aut peccatoris fide quae illius opus et ipsum sine operibus suis sibi postulat. Ex quo fit ut si hisce Domini verbis, quae hanc rem non attingunt, usus ratiocineris, necesse sit fallaris. Quid enim de propitiatione loquitur Scriptura ? Nonne eam de cruce Christi, de sanguine illius in remissionem peccatorum effuso, de hoc quod semel pro peccatis passus sit iustus pro iniustis ut nos ad Deum perduceret pendere dicit ? Quae quidem plenius confirmant haec e Novo Testamento petita, Rom. iii. 25, iv. 25, v. 9, 10 ; 1 Cor. xv. 3 ; 2 Cor. v. 21 ; Gal. i. 4, iii. 16 ; Eph. i. 7, 31, iv. 22, v. 2 ; Col. i. 14, 20 ; 1 Tim. i. 6 ; Tit. ii. 14 ; Ebr. i. 3, ii. 9, 14, ix. 12, 14, 15, 24-28, x. 5-10, 12-19, xii. 24, xiii. 12, 20 ; 1 Pet. i. 2, 18-21, ii. 24, iii. 18 ; 1 Ioh. i. 7, ii. 2, iv. 10 ; Apoc. i. 5, v. 9, vii. 14 ; alia. Num debemus illa adiicere quae in Evangeliiis praemissa erant qualia Matt. xx. 28, xxvi. 28 ; Ioh. i. 29 ; multa alia ? Tamen idoneum fuerit nonnulla e Vetere Testamento, quae typorum ordinem haud dubie tenent, paucis attingere. Primum ergo, sanguis agni nocte paschae caesi extra, non intra, domum spangebatur, in superliminari et super postes, non ut Israel verum ut Deus aspiceret ; quod ipse ita dicit, “ Et videbo sanguinem, et transibo vos.” In sacrificiis etiam sanguis in cornibus Dei arae effusus ipsi Deo, nunquam autem homini offerebatur. In non-

nullis etiam homines, scilicet leprosi, sacerdotes, alii, sanguine spargebantur ut mundarentur, ut coram Deo praecipue mundi essent. In summis autem omnium, propitiationis die, templo inferebatur et super propitiatorio et coram ponebatur. Hoc autem quid vult nisi illud vel plenius demonstrare sanguinem pro hominibus coram Deo esse, non tantum amoris Dei erga homines documentum? Quibus ita utitur Novum Testamentum ut affirmet Christum per proprium sanguinem introisse. Nam illud quidem, devenisse eum et mortuum esse prae amore erga homines non minus verum, diversum autem esse videtur. Atque hic quidem, aperto loquente Scriptura, nulla de amore Dei amplius quam Christi dubitatio esse potest. Misit Pater Filium, porro sic dilexit mundum Deus ut Filium suum unigenitum daret. Pariter autem constat Filium exaltari oportuisse, oportebat autem non tantum ob malum hominum, verum ob Dei verba, iustitiam, sanctam naturam, maiestatem, quae vindicari debebant ut hominibus iure ignosceretur. Quae omnia, imo longe plus, efficit crux Christi. Propter peccata ille a Deo derelictus est, Psal. xxii. ; neque hic de Iudaeis aut Gentilibus, de Herode aut Pontio Pilato, nisi ut de improbis persecutoribus, agebatur. Etiam Deus ad crucem adfuit, qui Christum pro nobis peccatum effecerit, ut in eo nos fieremus iustitia Dei. Prius ille pro iustitia, sanctitate, gratia passus erat, pro peccatis tum passus est. Haec est propitiatio quae sola credentis peccata expiare potest, neque huius exspectatio nova exstitit, quamquam novum erat factum. Nam, quod dicit princeps prophetarum ;—
 “Vulneratus est propter iniquitates nostras, attritus est propter scelera nostra : disciplina pacis nostrae super eum, et livore ejus sanati sumus.” “Posuit Dominus in eo iniquitatem omnium nostrum.” “Propter scelus populi mei percussi eum.” “Et Dominus voluit conterere eum in infirmitate ; si posuerit pro peccato animam suam, videbit semen longaezum,” etc. “Iniquitates eorum ipse portabit.” “Ipse peccata multorum tulit.”

Consentiunt Lex, Psalmi, Prophetae ; pariter Vetus Novum-

que Testamentum a Deo et coram Deo propter peccata nostra passum fuisse Christum affirmant. Nuntiavit Dominus, apostoli (Paulus imprimis) iterant, nec minime carus ille discipulus qui maxime laudat Dei amorem, auctum revera hoc cognito, quippe vires et profunditatem suam tum demum ostendentem quum poculum hoc a Patre acceptum bibisset Christum intellexeris. Non totam efficiunt veritatem Dei amor, odia hominum, Satanae potentia, imo haec omnia profunditate superat illud, Christum pro peccatis hostiam se obtulisse Deo. Sane amorem Dei infinite imminuerit is qui Christum peccatorum nostrorum iudicium a Deo factum passum fuisse non viderit. Is enim de hominum peccatis negligentiam, contemptum Dei sanctitatis, maiestatis, monitorum qualia leguntur Deut. xxvii. 26, Rom. ii. 9, Ebr. x. 31, esse eum effecerit. Contra demonstrant laudata fidei Dei vindicandae necessariam fuisse expiationem, si nocentes etiamsi crederent, salvos facere vellet. Iudicium passus est Christus ut ad peccatorem manaret gratia. Ergo iustitiam non minus quam gratiam nunc monstrat Deus.

Qui ergo contendunt falsam esse omnem theologiam quae aliam faciat Patris imaginem aliam Filii, negabuntne Deum contrivisse Christum, hunc a Deo derelictum mortuum fuisse crimen nostrum expiantem coram Deo qui suscitavit eum a mortuis? Quae si faciunt aliud haud dubie verum pervertunt, ut aliud aequè verum et gravissimum negent. Sane ex fide non ex operibus iustificatur homo: verum perfecitne Christus illud opus cui sacrificia propitiationis die peracta velut typi praemittebantur? Vaticinatur Isaia, cap. liii., narrant Matt. et Marc. Domini passionem, ut ipse loquitur, Deo derelinquente, quod inter poenas nostrorum peccatorum vel miserimum erat. Num Dei vindictae, passionis Christi, eadem est imago? Mihi quidem inter haec summum fuisse discrimen videtur, et tamen pacis consilium ambobus adfuit. Quae ergo obiecta sunt, e falsa pendent interpretatione eorum quae

leguntur Ioh. xiv. 9, haec enim de Christi persona, non de opere eius, revera dicta sunt. Qui haec de cruce dicta accipiunt, ita ut Dominum pro peccatis nostris a Deo punitum fuisse negent, ii propitiationis doctrinam quae in Scriptura continetur, eiusque in Christo fundamenta interpretando summovent. Quid enim, nisi hoc, efficere vult controversia?

Porro illud postulant, iustitiam Dei eandem esse debere atque Christi iustitiam, qui autem affirmet Patri esse bonam qualitatem qua careat Filius, eum revera negare hunc esse Deum aut Dei similem. In quo vehementer errant; est enim iustitia, ut alibi, ita hic, mores idonei relationi in qua stat quisque. Patet ergo, quomodo inter homines alia est servi alia domini iustitia, parique modo alia filii alia parentis, uxoris alia quam quae mariti, denique alia civis alia regis, ita esse iustitiam in illo "qui quum in forma Dei esset, non rapinam arbitratus est esse se aequalem Deo: sed semetipsum exinanivit, formam servi accipiens, in similitudinem hominum factus et habitu inventus ut homo humiliavit semetipsum, factus obediens usque ad mortem, mortem autem crucis. Propter quod et Deus exaltavit illum;"—Filius ergo ut non caret qualitatibus illis quas habet Pater, ita illas habet, qua homo est, quas non habet Pater, neque habere posset, quippe qui carnem nunquam sumpserit. Eius enim qui dirigit sive imperat iustitia alia est, alia eius qui paret. "Propterea me diligit Pater; quia ego pono animam meam, ut iterum sumam eam." Factum quidem ipsius, ex obedientia tamen Patris sui erat Ioh. x, 17, 18. Personae Christi mysterium simile aliud in morte sequitur, si ergo alterum tantum in ea, sive id quod ad Deum sive id quod ad hominem pertinebat respicias, personam divides, opus evacuabis, veritatem amittes. "Nemo novit Filium, nisi Pater." Verbo quidem illius debemus parere, universo autem, non parti tantum. Filius est Iesus, qui non modo similis est Dei, nam vere Deus est, et plene Deus, aequae ac Pater et Spiritus Sanctus. Porro in ipso

complacuit omnem plenitudinem inhabitare," et inhabitat corporaliter; ut tamen divinitatis personae non modo unam naturam, verum etiam unam mentem, consilium, voluntatem habent, ita in his manifestandis diverse agunt, quod apparet, *e.g.*, Matt. iii. 16, 17, nam tres sunt non minus quam unum. Et quidem Christus quum esset Filius Dei, didicit ex iis quae passus est obedientiam. Itaque fieri non potuit quin in ipso qualitates inessent perfectae in suo genere, quae a Patre aberant, atque etiam ab ipso, donec servi locum sumeret, factus homo in terris. Etiam planius hoc in cruce videtur, illic enim novum incepit opus suo in genere unicum, quod sequebantur gratia et gloria infinita, aeterna; et in passione per quam factum est. Quae omnia Christi divinitatem nihilo plus imminuere volunt quam negare eum Patrem manifestare aut Deum ostendere. Qui autem dubitant Patrem et Filium, dum hic in terra versatur, diverse egisse ac praecipue apud crucem, ii non in Romanum quidem cultum verum in Sabellianorum doctrinam, quae nequitia longe superat Romanam, incidunt, et longe plus pugnant cum sancta Scriptura quam cum Anselmi theologia, quam ipsam parvi equidem pendo.

Neque tamen cum theologis debemus emptionem cum redemptione confundere. Totus mundus, omnes mortales, etiam mali sanguine Christi empti sunt; nulli vero nisi credentes habent redemptionem (*ἀπολύτρωσιν*) per sanguinem ejus, remissionem peccatorum, quamvis *ὑπὲρ πάντων* sit τὸ ἀντίλυτρον. Per emptionem quidem omnes eius possessio sive servi efficiuntur; per redemptionem vero potestate Satanae liberamur, Christi liberti, ut Deo liberi pareamus. Illa autem regis morientis inter vincendum pro exercitu similitudo, illudne serio agitur ut neget sanguinem Christi effusum pro peccatis sacrificium non pro hominibus tantum sed Deo pretium solutum esse? Nihil est illud quidem affirmare Deum diligere mundum atque ita diligere ut Filium suum miserit qui credentibus vitam aeternam det, hoc enim diversum est ab illo, aeque vero, quod

“ipse ad destitutionem peccati per hostiam suam apparuit.” Hostia vero secundum Scripturam Deo sacrificatur, nunquam autem creaturae, quod est idolorum servitus, ut est contra remotio sacrificii infidelitas. Ac certissime redemptionis opus, remissio peccatorum, per sanguinem fit, per passionem quae fuit propitiationis causa in cruce, non per omnem potestatem in coelo et in terra datam a Deo homini quem a mortuis suscitavit. Neque oblivisci debemus, cum Christo subiecta fuerint omnia et ille tradiderit regnum, fieri hoc non ut Pater, verum ut Deus, scilicet Pater, Filius, Spiritus sanctus, sit omnia in omnibus.

"FOR THE DEFENCE OF THE GOSPEL."

Εἰς ἀπολογίαὶν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου κείμεαι—PHIL. i. 16.

ARE the foundations destroyed? Is there any longer a Christ or Christianity, the Word or the Church of God? Such is the question raised by the writings of the present-day theological speculators and modern critics. It becomes now indeed (sad to say it!) an urgent question whether there be a Bible as a revelation from God, in words which God inspired, and whether there be such a thing as Christianity or the Church of God on earth. Certainly no creed or confession formulates the Christianity of the Scriptures, and no Church in Christendom now holds to the unity of the Spirit, or acknowledges His personal presence on earth. If otherwise, which is it?

The authority of the Bible having been very specially assailed in our land as well as in every country in the world, most of its leading doctrines having been either ignored, impugned, or rejected, it behoves individual Christians, who still value the Holy Scriptures as the Word of God, and who realise the awful crisis of un-faith into which the whole professing Church is drifting, to look to the Lord to maintain the standard of His own glory, and give them grace to "witness a good confession" of the truth by re-asserting the original testimony of God as given by the Holy Ghost. When the Church corporate has manifestly ceased to be "the pillar and ground of the truth," it devolves on every soul who values the Holy Scriptures and has faith in the living God, to cling to the person of the Christ of God, who reveals Himself to the faithful as the Holy and the True, "He that openeth, and no man shutteth," holding fast His Word, and not denying His name (Rev. ii

With all humility and self-judgment, yet with firmness and faith confiding in the grace of God, as one who loves the truth and confesses the name of Christ, the writer ventures to recall the faithful and loyal disciples of Christ to faith in the Holy Scriptures as the inspired revelation of God, to union with the glorified Christ by the Holy Ghost, to the fact of the Holy Spirit's presence on earth, and to the privileges and responsibilities of membership of the body of Christ, by the publication of *THE BIBLE WITNESS AND REVIEW*, which has these very specially for its objects. It will seek to uphold the inspiration and authority of the written Word of God, and, by the direct presentation of the revelation of God contained in the Holy Scriptures, to expose and refute, as far as allowed of God, the deadly errors which now pervade the whole of Christendom alike Romish and Protestant.

The questions now raised everywhere are vital and fundamental ; and they are just such as we care to handle, for Scripture principles are catholic, not sectarian, and our periodical exists for no party, but for the edification of the saints of God in every place, and the maintenance of divine truth as revealed. All who are dear to Christ are dear to us ; and one would hope that a crisis like the present may draw the children of God together in closer fellowship, that they may "stand fast in one spirit, with one mind striving together for the faith of the gospel."

We rejoice that a few have given "Together" their renewed testimony to Christ and Christianity and the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, and we look to the Lord to own the truth presented, and increase the number of those who love it and are able to use it in testimony to Him. Blind is the man who does not see a more intense and widespread power of Satan put forth of late against the Scriptures and the testimony of God, and more especially through pseudo-criticism and theological speculation ; and this necessitates the presentation of such papers as the Christian reader will find, it is believed, in the opening volume

of our testimony, giving as they do the Scripture doctrine, and thus confronting and refuting error with truth. The front is changed. The conflict is for the very existence of a revelation from God and of Christianity; and the specific aim must be to keep this in the forefront as that in which the real dignity and moral elevation of man consist. The rights of the Creator and the creature to have to do with each other are the real question with the enemy. We shall thus "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints," bringing men face to face with the living God speaking in the Holy Scriptures. The written Word of God is our supreme authority and our only standard. *"Let God be true, but every man a liar."*

Those who fight the Lord's battles must make up their minds to be scorned and little accounted of on earth; but it is enough that the Lord Jesus approves of any faithful testimony rendered to His name. "Thou hast kept My word, and hast not denied My name," is no little praise in a day when the word of testimony for Christ is being sacrificed to a temporising and worldly expediency, and when Christ's name seems no longer to have commanding authority even amongst His own servants. There never was a time when there was more general knowledge about Him in the professing church, with more indifference to Himself,—a saying of "Lord, Lord," and yet not doing the things which He so plainly enjoins. "I will spue thee out of My mouth," is the end of this heartless and unconscionable indifferentism (Rev. iii. 14-21).

It is very sad that the majority of the theological professors of the day are more or less touched with rationalism, or not inclined to denounce it as incipient infidelity. A great number especially of the younger ministers are reading approvingly the popular literature of the day—which is at the best but theistic, not Christian—and making their sermons on the literary models of Anglican and American preachers of high intellect but more than questionable soundness, the pabulum for which is mainly

drawn from German divines and commentators, not one of whose writings is fully orthodox. Thus, straining to become intellectual, they vitiate the truth instead of letting it judge themselves and their hearers. There is no longer, with such, a distinct preaching of Christ Himself as our living Head, and of His cross, the Spirit's cure for worldliness in Christianity (1 Cor. i. ii. iii. iv.; Gal. vi. 12-14). There is thus a letting down of the testimony of our Lord, an avoidance of the offence of the cross, and a mixing up of church and world in every conceivable way; as if it had been the church's mission to attach the world to itself in all its worldliness, denying all real difference between them, and as if no such word as that uttered by our Lord, "Ye cannot serve God and mammon," had ever been spoken. The preaching being lowered, the practice is correspondingly low, and professing Christians try to think it right to countenance all sorts of semi-worldly shows and demonstrations, and the scandal occasioned is terrible! But these are merely the fruits of unfaithfulness to Christ. The root is a more serious thing, and will be found to exist in the colourless, non-christian, yea antichristian, teaching to which we have already alluded. Would that it were uncharitable to suppose that there are professors training the future ministers of all the modern churches, who in themselves never to have lain before a just and holy God in the judgment of their sins by the death of Christ, known by faith and in the living grace of the Holy Ghost. But surely, judged by their writings, some have merely an intellectual knowledge of the Scriptures, just as they would, by their general ability, have become proficient in any other science; and hence they teach their subjects as scientists in theology, not as lost sinners saved by the absolute grace of God. Their writings show that although they may be acquainted with critical and theological works, they are in darkness regarding the drift of Divine revelation, and cannot tell out, as men who have an unction from the Holy One,

the testimony of the Holy Ghost in the holy Scriptures to the glory of God's Son. There is not such a thing as *the truth* in their teaching, for they do not know it. They cannot help glean- ing many true things from their multifarious reading ; but, as it was to the theologians of His day that our Lord said, "Ye shall know *the truth*, and *the truth* shall make you free ;" and again, "Because I tell you *the truth*, ye believe me not ;" so these scientific theologians know a variety of truths, but not *the truth* ; and hence, not having it, they cannot communicate it. It is not found apart from living contact with the Person of Christ, and the living grace of the Holy Ghost, and the true sayings of God in the holy Scriptures. *The truth* being the God-thought in Christ, could these professors tell you *scripturally* the truth of the nature, person, life, death, intercession, priesthood, headship, kingship, church or kingdom,—present life in heaven, future glory there or reign on earth, of the Christ of God? If not, would it not demonstrate that *the truth* is not in them? Where- fore Christ, who is "*the Truth*," being unknown—His person and sacrifice, grace and glory, being misapprehended—they can- not do otherwise than make a sorry business of their professional work, and pour into the youths they misteach principles and doctrines entirely alien from the plan of God for the glory of Christ revealed in the holy Scriptures, as indeed is the whole system of their theology from its foundation to its keystone. And a human system of theology being taught in the colleges, it is in due time transferred to the churches ; and if one were going into the churches or chapels over the land, would he not find the homogeneity of the erroneous teaching persistently adhered to? The country is full of this theology : but where is Christ? He is all but unknown as the Holy Ghost has revealed Him in the word of God. And what deliverance can there be since Christ, who delivers us from this present evil world, is un- known? This modern theology and preaching never contem- plate separation to God in the knowledge and enjoyment of the

Father's love as new creatures in Christ ; but rather a patronising of modern literature and worldly amusements, and an annexing of the ambitious pursuits of time and sense, veneering them with religion. Hence men practically come to the conclusion that the Saviour's words, "Ye cannot serve God and mammon," no longer carry with them their former grave meaning of moral impossibility, and they seek to "make the best of both worlds."

The godly are at their wits' end : for their falling in with the recent rage for young unproved professors, because of their alleged intellectual powers, irrespective of divine knowledge of Christ and soul-consuming love to Him and zeal for His glory, has brought them the present harvest of heresy, and the sorrowful impossibility of rooting it out. Every such sowing yields its inevitable harvest. "Be not deceived ; God is not mocked ; *for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap*" (Gal. vi. 7).

But many will ask in amazement, Are the professors really unsound ? The godly in Scotland and elsewhere have been disquieted in vain if Professor Smith's article in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* on "The Bible" be an orthodox production.

And it is not Professor Smith only who is unsound. Are there not other professors in the same ecclesiastical sphere who are gravely suspected of unsoundness in the faith ? Of even the lately published course of *Cunningham Lectures* a review comes from the United States which does not hesitate to characterise the book as "a convenient index to all the follies of half-heathen 'fathers,' as well as the modern and semi-heathen dreams of self-satisfied Germans ; and an occasion of displaying all its author had read of both. But the writer's own statements are really painful, so that it is hard to think he has ever realised in truth what Christ is. He talks of 'the curriculum of Christ's sufferings ;' of 'a good understanding between the Father and the Son' ! (on the cross, I think) ; of Son of man being 'a pet name' of Christ's. How can one who uses such language have any sense of what is divine and gracious ? It is offensive and

revolting to every right feeling. He is, though nominally orthodox, really imbued with the poison of German infidelity, and in some of its worst shapes: his system of doctrine is not the truth, but the restoration of humanity, and connection of Christ, or rather union of Christ, with man in the flesh, in contrast with a risen Christ, the Head of the new creation, to whom we are united by the Holy Ghost. In the Mercersburg theology this is run to seed; but it is the great point in question, a grave and weighty one which lies at the basis of the nature of Christianity, and on which your theological writers are wholly away from Scripture and truth: as are Irving, and 'Mercersburg,' and the like. The only consistent representatives, the old pious minds, may have been kept, by the conclusion it led to, from falling grossly into it. No man could treat Beyschlag and others as the lecturer does, with any proper reverence for Christ in his heart; but it is the effect of not drawing from Scripture, and losing faith by theological speculations substituted for it. It is at the root of much error in this day, and is undermining the Presbyterian churches everywhere, where they are not infidel and Socinian."

Let it not be supposed that any one body is singled out for assault. Alas! the powers of evil now at work are legion; heterodoxy and scepticism in a religious as well as a profane garb are to be found everywhere. But it is no light sign of the times that a church once assumed to be careful of doctrine and discipline seems now lapsing into suicidal compromise on the part of her representative men counted godly and orthodox.

We gladly own that there are gracious men and godly ministers of Christ in all the ecclesiastical systems, whose hearts beat true to Christ, and whose preaching of the gospel is in the living power of the Holy Ghost; but such faithful men are few, and they are daily vexing their righteous souls, like Lot in Sodom, with the unscriptural doctrine and worldly practices with which they are unhappily connected. It is a living martyrdom for a man who knows and preaches the testimony of God

in any measure of fulness to be in any of 'the churches,' for he will be constantly regarded with suspicion, and treated by his brethren as a speckled bird. This demonstrates the accuracy of our sorrowful affirmation that the truth of Christianity and the faithful confessors of it are now looked upon as intruders and exotics within the entire range of the churches of Christendom.

A record of facts such as these, and their consequences, warrant, yea demand, such a periodical as *The Bible Witness and Review*, that we may bear witness to the truth, and give what help we may be enabled to impart to the saints of God at this solemn crisis.

On the one hand, it must continue to be a painful occupation to watch and warn against an every-day departure from the truth and from God. On the other, it will prove a happy employment to point out and invite attention to publications that grasp the grand idea of "the faith of God's elect," and what it is, and the acknowledging of "the truth which is after godliness," and where it is! These were the original peculiarities of Christianity, as charged upon Titus (when endangered) by the apostle Paul. They were embodied and ministered first by Christ when on earth, and established with Him in heaven; but are now carried out by the Holy Ghost, as the witness from Him to us, come down to dwell with us, as the "other Paraclete." They are therefore essentially divine in their formation and display, in the midst of God's elect below, till Christ's shout bids them rise up to meet Him in the air. This circle of truth, which includes "the testimony of our Lord" to Timothy, and "the faith once delivered to the saints" as by Jude, stands forth in other and *new* relations towards God and the elect; in contrast with what was old in the former economy of Judaism.

For example, ought a Christian now to allow it to be said that "the faith of God's elect," or "the truth which is after godliness" by Paul, formed any part in the ministry of Moses? Grace, and the calling by grace into oneness with the Second

Man in glory above, cannot in their nature be confounded with the recognition "of man in the flesh," placed under the law and covenants, and a worshipper in the "worldly sanctuary"!

These and other distinctions must be maintained, to see the order of God in relation to the place of Israel on earth, and the present order of God as regards the church, both as to her place and portion with Christ above. She also is become the vessel of testimony to the world, but on behalf of the rejected Lord and King, till as the bride she is caught up when the marriage of the Lamb is come.

The Bible thus, in its two parts, embraces the earth and the heavens, and unites both with Christ in present purpose and final blessing. It also gives the history and destiny of "the families in heaven and earth," as redeemed to God by faith in the precious blood shed on the cross. Held and maintained in its "grace and truth" by the power of the Holy Ghost, it presents the only remedy for a guilty conscience and the heart it has broken in upon in grace and love. It opens out its boundless resources, in the fulness of Christ, to us as believers, so that "the life we live in the flesh we live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved us and gave Himself for us." As ministered on the journey of life, by the grace of Christ, it is the balm for every wound. Jesus sees us, and comes to us where we are, pouring in oil and wine, and takes care of us, for He has travelled over the road that leads from Jerusalem to Jericho for Himself! How we need such a heart as His in a day like this! And is *this* the foul work that the enemy puts men to do against themselves, not merely to cavil at God because He is so good, but corrupt the Bible, and deny the genuineness of the records which make Him known to us, in the Son of His bosom?

The devil can only repeat himself in his history with man—for sin must be against love and light to reach its enormity; and so it was not till after Jesus had dipped the sop and handed it to Judas "that Satan entered into him." "Contend earnestly

for the faith once delivered to the saints" is a word in season—for what is "the faith of God's elect," or "the truth which is after godliness," if we are robbed of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost in known relationships? Beyond the sorrows and cares of human life, and whilst in the midst of this evil world, where sin, and death, and Satan reign, the Bible gives us the blessed hope of the Lord's coming to receive us to Himself, that where He is, there we may be also. The enemy's malice is to take away this bright hope from the heart that cannot do without it, and to steal from the purged conscience its present peace with God, and to deprive the soul of its comfort in the Holy Ghost amidst the wear and tear of every-day life. Where is succour to come from, or the hand that can wipe away the tears, or else put them into His bottle, but in the sympathy of the living love of the living Lord above, who is touched with the feeling of our infirmities? Rude and rough is the hand that would turn any away from the sources of life and strength, outside ourselves, in the Father's love. In the wilderness our springs are in "the Rock that is higher than we," and daily the manna comes down to us, around our tent, before even the sun is up. God's first care is for his own, and He will be first! Pass we over the Jordan to Gilgal (as having done with works "in the flesh" and with the wilderness), it is but to know Him better, and ourselves brought nearer. We are upon His own ground there as heavenly men, and eat the corn of the land. The grapes of Eshcol are ours, and we gather them where they grow. May the land, and the corn and the fruit that grow therein, be the attractive power that keeps the heart and its affections true to Christ, and so satisfied with what satisfies Him at the right hand of God, that our dwelling-place may be far up above the camp and its confusions!

True, we shall the more clearly see and understand the shame of the calf and the dancing below, and the outrage of the

captain, in the midst of a hesitating people, who propose a return to Egypt, instead of a closer walk with God.

In these last days, the deception by "the angel of light," throughout the length and breadth of Christendom, is much in advance and far more dangerous than the "calf" and the "captain" of a visible and material economy. Satan knows how "to transform himself" to suit the character of a spiritual dispensation while the Holy Ghost is in the house. After the church is gone, he will not scruple to come on lower ground, and as "the dragon" of the Apocalypse "give power to the beast" whom the world will worship, saying, "Who is like unto the beast?"

"But ye, beloved, building up yourselves on your most holy faith, praying in the Holy Ghost, keep yourselves in the love of God, looking for the mercy of the Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life. And of some have compassion making a difference, and others save with fear, pulling them out of the fire, hating even the garment spotted with the flesh."

What a comfort, with unhesitating confidence, and in the calm repose of faith and hope, which admit of neither doubt nor question, to join in the doxology—"Now unto Him that is able to keep you from falling, and to present you faultless before the presence of His glory with exceeding joy, to the only wise God our Saviour, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, now and for ever. Amen."

FINIS.

Printed by R. & R. CLARK, Edinburgh.